

1/10
557237

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

V. 43
(1913.)

P.D.

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. XLIII—NO. 1.

JANUARY, 1913.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.

GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT

1913

Lutheran
*DA

CONTENTS

I. THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. PAUL'S EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, ALLENTOWN, PA.	1
BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.	
II. THE NEW EVANGELISM	14
BY M. H. VALENTINE, D.D.	
III. THE KIND OF PREACHING THAT I LIKE	27
A Layman's Symposium.—By L. RUSSELL ALDEN, ESQ., MR. HARRY TENNYSON DOMER, A.M. MR. P. A. ELSESSER, F. S. LEISENRING, M.D., GEORGE E. NEFF, ESQ., GEO. H. REIMENSNYDER, ESQ., MR. I. SEARLES RUNYON, WILLIAM C. STOEVEY, ESQ.	
IV. HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE BEGINNINGS OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE	40
BY H. M. J. KLEIN.	
V. GOTTHILF HEINRICH ERNST MUHLENBERG	59
BY B. C. SCHIEDT.	
VI. METAPOLITICS AND SOCIAL REFORM	70
BY PROFESSOR W. H. WYNN, D.D.	
VII. MODERN ATTACKS UPON THE CHURCH	84
BY REV. J. C. JACOBY, D.D.	
VIII. SOME HARMFUL RESULTS OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM	95
BY REV. ADAM STUMP, D.D.	
IX. THE GROUND AND NECESSITY OF THE MISSION-ARY ENTERPRISE	106
BY PROFESSOR EDWARD PFKIFFER.	
X. BEGINNINGS OF LUTHERANISM IN OHIO	116
BY PROFESSOR B. F. PRINCE, PH.D.	
XI. CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT	131
I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D. II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D.	
XII. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE	150
<p>Philosophy of the Future—Outlines of Liturgics—The Lutheran Almanac and Year Book for 1913—Mother—Brief History of Modern Philosophy—The Christian View of the Old Testament—Biblical Criticism and Preaching—Crises in the Early Church—Origin and Antiquity of Man—Freemasonry—The Doctrine of Man—The Life of the Rev. Benjamin Bausman, D.D., LL.D.</p>	

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1913.

ARTICLE I.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. PAUL'S EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, ALLENTOWN, PA.¹

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

Lutherans came to America first from Holland, probably as early as 1632 as a part of the Dutch colony which settled on Manhattan Island, now the site of the city of New York. It is not known when they made their first attempt at organizing a congregation, but it is a matter of history that when a little band of Lutherans petitioned Governor Stuyvesant for the privilege of worshipping in a church by themselves, the Governor, a zealous Calvinist, denied the petition "for the reason that he was bound by his oath to tolerate openly no other religion than the Reformed." Finally, however, in 1657, after being cruelly persecuted, the Lutherans were permitted by the authorities in Holland to have their own pastor in the person of the Rev. John Ernest Goetwater, who was the first Lutheran minister in New Amsterdam. Alas! for their hopes the new pastor was forbidden by the authorities to preach in public.

It is not our purpose to follow the misfortunes of these first Lutherans in America. They sustain, however, an intimate relation to St. Paul's Church in that one of its early pastors was

1 The sources of information are the *Hallesche Nachrichten*, the *Documentary History of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania*, the *Historical Discourse of Dr. Beale Schmucker*, the Records of St. Paul's Church, various histories, traditions, etc.

a descendant of these Dutch Lutherans who settled on the banks of the Hudson.

The second arrival of Lutherans in America was that of the Swedes who purposed to found a New Sweden on the banks of the Delaware. They arrived early in 1638 and landed near what is now the city of Lewes in the State of Delaware. They purchased from the Indians a tract of land extending from the mouth of Delaware Bay northward to the Falls of Trenton and westward to the Susquehanna near York Haven, embracing the State of Delaware and south-eastern Pennsylvania. This was fifty years before William Penn's famous treaty with the Indians.

The Swedes made their first settlement where Wilmington now stands, and built their block-house, in which divine service was held, and which was named Fort Christiana. This was the first Lutheran Church in America, and here also the first Lutheran pastor, the Rev. Reorus Torkillus, officiated. The first Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania was built in 1646 at Tinicum in Delaware county. "For a century and three-quarters the six Swedish Lutheran congregations on the Delaware were served by thirty-five pastors, the last of whom died in 1831. As the Swedish was replaced by the English language, they were gradually transferred to the Episcopal Church." Thus ends that second melancholy chapter of the history of the founding of the Lutheran Church in America.

The history of St. Paul's Church begins properly with the first German emigrants of the Palatinates to Pennsylvania in 1680. The first German Lutheran congregation in the United States was organized at Falkner's Swamp (New Hanover), Montgomery county, Pa., in the year 1700. The Rev. Justus Falckner, the first pastor, was ordained by the Swedish clergymen, and was the first man ordained to the Lutheran ministry in America. Immigration grew rapidly thenceforward. It is estimated that in 1750 of a population in Pennsylvania of between 175,000 and 220,000 fully 60,000 were Lutherans.

"The temporal condition of these early Lutherans was then but equalled by their melancholy spiritual destitution. The great body had come over the water without any religious instructors, without any organization or formal bond between them, and without any pecuniary means with which either to erect houses of worship or to employ ministers, had it been pos-

sible to secure any of their language." "The thousands of Germans in Pennsylvania and the adjacent provinces had not a single State government, nor a single Church organization to look after their spiritual welfare, and, excepting the active Court-chaplain Ziegenhagen in London, and the noble Francke at Halle, and a few more of their Pietist brethren, there seems to have prevailed universal and absolute indifference among the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of Germany toward the spiritual welfare of their brethren who had emigrated to America." See Wolf's "Lutherans in America."

In 1735 there labored among the dispersed Lutherans of this country eight ordained ministers, and only one of these, the Rev. Caspar Stoever, was located in Pennsylvania at New Holland. Congregations were fortunate in many cases to receive visits from ministers twice a year; and some indeed, were without any pastoral care for years at a time. And even worse than this, many congregations became a prey to incompetent and wicked ministers, who had been expelled from the sacred office in the Fatherland.

The destitution of our American Lutheran people weighed heavily on the hearts of the devout. A committee of two from three churches in Philadelphia, New Hanover, and Providence (Trappe), were appointed in 1733 to accompany Pastor Schultze to Europe in order to secure a pastor and also financial aid.

But nine weary years passed before the proper man was found by Dr. Francke of Halle in the person of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, who arrived in America in 1742. To him, under God, more than to any other man is the Lutheran Church under lasting obligation for his apostolic labors in establishing our beloved Church on this continent. He came with the motto, *Ecclesia plantanda*, "The Church must be planted." Henceforth the scattered congregations must be affiliated and organized. The city of Allentown is to be congratulated on being the site of a college, bearing the illustrious name of Muhlenberg, a name that should be honored by giving to the college the ample support which it so richly merits.

The first American Synod, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, was convened by Muhlenberg and his co-laborers on August 26, 1748, in the city of Philadelphia. It consisted of six ministers and twenty-four lay delegates. Of the latter, two came from

Upper Milford, and one from Saccum (Saucon), both in what is now Lehigh county, and not remote from Allentown. The name of the church at Macunshy (Macungie), the so-called Lehigh Church near Alburtis, is first mentioned in the minutes of 1750. The ministers of the following year record that "the Makunshy people, who, at their request were received by us last year, have left us again and have burdened themselves with a godless teacher of whom they would now like to be rid."

The first mention of Allentown in the Protocol of the Ministerium is in the minutes of the Sixteenth Convention, held in Philadelphia, Oct. 16-19, 1763. There was no delegate present "on account of fear of attacks by the Indians." A letter was also read "from the inhabitants of Allentown in Hampton county, who desired * * Mr. Roth as their preacher, but since that time have mostly been put to flight and scattered by the Indians."

To complete the background upon which we are to project the history of St. Paul's congregation, let us look for a moment at contemporaneous events. The Lutheran Church in the United States in 1748 had only 16 ministers and 40 congregations, with probably 5,000 members. In 1762 I estimate that there were 50 ministers, 200 congregations and 10,000 members.

One hundred years later, in 1860, there were 1134 ministers, 2017 congregations and 235,000 communicants. Fifty years after this, in 1912, there were 8713 ministers, 14,070 congregations, and 2,254,019 communicants. These are associated in about 70 district synods, of which about three-fourths belong to four general bodies. This vast number represents a constituency of not less than ten millions, or one out of ten of the population of the United States. There are more Lutheran communicants in and about Allentown to-day than there were in all the Colonies 150 years ago.

In 1760 the population of the Colonies numbered two millions; now the population of the United States is ninety-three millions. Pennsylvania had a population of 200,000; now over 7,500,000. Allentown was a village numbering a few hundred people; now it is a splendid city with beautiful streets lined with fine buildings, and has a population of 53,000, with probably twice as many more within a radius of ten miles. The enormous growth in the population of this country in a century and

a half is more than paralleled by the incalculable increase in wealth and the advance in science and the practical arts of life.

When St. Paul's was founded George III had just begun (1760) his despotic and incompetent reign of sixty years. The French and Indian War, one of the most diabolical of history, was drawing to its close, with victory for the colonists of Great Britain. One of the most memorable events of this period was the Treaty of Paris in 1763 by which all the French possessions east of the Mississippi were surrendered to Great Britain; and those west of the great river were ceded to Spain, which subsequently ceded them to the United States. Thus ended a great conflict in favor of the languages and the institutions of the Anglo-Saxon race.

St. Paul's has lived through all the great wars of our country and has rendered patriotic devotion to its flag. It has been contemporaneous with all the great men of the land from Washington and Franklin to the present. It has witnessed the election of every governor of this Commonwealth and of every President of the United States. It has lived through the transformation of industrial and commercial pursuits from primitive ways and tools to the high efficiency secured by the inventive genius of man. But even more than this, it has beheld the emancipation not only of the African negro, but in a large sense that of the human race from the thralldom of tyranny, and of superstition. Mighty revolutions have taken place and are still going on, promising at length the triumph of the brotherhood of the race in the republic of mankind.

Allentown was named after Chief Justice William Allen, who laid out the village in 1762. He transferred his ownership in 1767 to his son William Allen. In the year 1762 the German Evangelical Lutheran congregation united with the German Reformed in the erection of a log church on a lot in the rear of the present handsome Zion Reformed Church on Hamilton street.

This was not the first Lutheran Church in this vicinity; for the Union Church in Salisburg township had been erected in 1741. The Lutherans and the German Reformed having both come from the Palatinate, where they suffered the most violent persecutions, dwelt together in harmony. And though the day of union churches is past, we are glad to know that sentiments

of Christian fraternity have always characterized the relations of St. Paul's and Zion's.

The first pastor of St. Paul's was John Joseph Roth, born in Siegen, Germany. He was first a student for the Catholic priesthood, but became a Lutheran and was received after due examination and admonition into the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in 1763. It is in connection with this meeting that the name Allentown first occurs in the *Hallesche Nachrichten*. No delegates were present on account of fear of the Indians; but a letter had been sent asking that Mr. Roth be confirmed as their pastor. He served churches in Upper Milford, Indianfield, Allentown and Saucon, where his remains were interred in 1764, after a very brief ministry.

A long vacancy of five years followed the death of Mr. Roth. However, toward the close of the year 1769 these congregations, together with the one in Macungie township, secured the services of the Rev. Jacob Van Buskirk, the great-great-grandfather of the present writer, to whom it is an interesting fact that he became pastor at Allentown 120 years after the election of his ancestor. Mr. Van Buskirk was a descendant of the Dutch who settled in New York. He was born at Hackensack, N. J., Feb. 11, 1739, and after preparing for the ministry at Princeton, and under his own pastor, J. A. Weygandt, he became a member of the household of Muhlenberg and his assistant. He bears the enviable distinction of being the first native American Lutheran pastor. He served Allentown from 1769 to 1778. After his resignation there was a vacancy of several years, during which, no doubt, neighboring pastors would minister to the flock.

In 1773 the Reformed congregation withdrew from the Union Church and erected a building of their own, while the Lutherans continued in the log church.

In 1781 the Protocol of Ministerium indicates that Allentown had now become a part of a charge with Dry Lands, Irish Settlement and Indianfield. This charge appealed to the Ministerium for a pastor, but none was to be had. It is commended to neighboring pastors for occasional preaching and the administration of the sacraments; and is advised to select capable lay-readers to teach the catechism and to lead the singing.

In 1783 John Christian Leps, a Dane, who had lived in the West Indies, was present at the Ministerium from Allentown.

He was an accomplished scholar and Dr. Kunze had engaged him as a teacher in a seminary which he was to establish, but which he failed in accomplishing. Mr. Leps consequently sought the pastorate, serving churches at first in New York State. He remained at Allentown probably only two years.

In one of the old Church records of St. Paul's occurs the name of the Rev. Carl Christoph Goetz, "a native of Worms." His first entry bears the date of November, 1785; the last, June 8, 1788. This is all I have been able to ascertain of him. He was apparently never a member of the Ministerium.

Again for five years the Church is without a pastor. In 1793 Licentiate Joseph Wichterman appears in the Protocol as pastor at Allentown, which he reports as having 123 communicants. This is the first record of communicants. Mr. Wichterman did not tarry long at Allentown.

In the same year George Frederick Ellisen, from Germany, was licensed and assigned as pastor of Upper Milford, Upper Saucon, Salisburg and Allentown. His name does not appear in the Protocol after 1796.

In 1794, during the pastorate of Licentiate Ellisen, the old log church was abandoned and the erection of a larger stone structure begun, on or near the site of the present building. From the accounts kept by the treasurer Leonard Nagle, we glean the following interesting facts. For the first time the record is made in English. Here the transition from the German begins. The trustees were John Horn, John Roth, Peter Hartz and Henry Schantz. The corner-stone was laid June 24, 1794. The dedication took place September 4, 1795. The cost was nearly 1300 pounds sterling or \$6500. Building was expensive at that time. Day laborers received from five to six shillings a day—\$1.25 to \$1.50. Pine boards cost \$22 per thousand feet. Nails were worth 22 cents per pound. \$230 were spent for this single item. "The old church was sold to Valentine Fatzinger at vendue for 17 pounds." The treasurer credits himself with six shillings and nine pence "for rum at the raising"! Rum was cheap; and total abstainers were rare in those days. Philip Klotz and Andrew Young collected in Philadelphia 99 pounds toward the cost of the new church. The indebtedness in March, 1797, was about 300 pounds.

A somewhat unusual event took place in 1798 in the interment

of the remains of Mrs. Margaret Tilgham under floor of the new Church. Mrs. Tilghman was the brilliant daughter of James Allen and the wife for only four years of William Tilghman, later Chief Justice of Pennsylvania. It is said that Mr. Tilghman contributed generously toward the payment of the debt resting on the Church. The remains were left unmolested at the erection of the next church edifice in 1855; but upon the erection of the present building the remains were taken up and re-interred in the foundation at the south-east corner.

In the year 1800 the Rev. John Conrad Yeager became pastor. His charge consisted of Christ Church, Hanover, (where he resided), Dry Lands, Friedens in Saucon, and Allentown. He preached once every four weeks in each of these churches. During his pastorate there was no evening service at Allentown. His salary here was \$100 a year. He continued pastor of the four churches until 1831 and was assisted for the four last years by his son Joshua, who was licensed in 1827. When the father relinquished Allentown and Friedens, the son became his successor. The opening of the Lehigh canal in 1830, when Allentown was a town of 1500 people, greatly stimulated the growth of the place, and a resident pastor and more frequent services became desirable. Mr. Yeager, therefore, moved to town and offered to preach every other Sunday morning for \$150 a year. The proposition was accepted; but the following year, on account of the death of his father, Mr. Yeager had to assume his father's work, and hence could preach in the morning only once in four weeks. It was arranged, however, that evening service be held on two Sundays a month. This continued until his resignation in 1852, with a salary of only \$175 a year.

In 1834 a union Sunday School was established by the Lutheran and the Reformed congregations. Mr. Yeager took an active part in this new movement, going from house to house, urging parents to send their children. For five years the school met in the Lutheran Church, until the completion of the new Reformed Church in which a special room was provided. In September, 1856, after the dedication of the new Lutheran Church, the school divided, each denomination organizing anew in their respective churches.

The rapid growth of Allentown made it desirable to have services more frequently, and also to have some of them in Eng-

lish. This induced Mr. Yeager to resign on Easter, April 11, 1852, his resignation going into effect at once. Thus closed the pastorate of father and son, extending over a period of fifty-two years of continued service.

During the pastorate of the Yeagers several events of lasting importance transpired. One of these was the forming of a new county. Until March 6, 1812, the present Lehigh county was included in Northampton, but was separated on that date from it by an act of Assembly. As far as I can discover, Allentown was so called from 1762 to 1811 when it was incorporated as the Borough of Northampton and became the seat of the new county of Lehigh the year following. In 1838 it resumed its original name which it has since borne.

The other event was the conveyance Nov. 3, 1813, on the part of Mary Livingston, who was the third daughter of James Allen, for the consideration of one dollar of certain lots of ground, 120 feet by 230 feet, on James street in the Borough of Northampton to Jacob Martin and George Reck and their successors, in trust for the use and benefit of the German Evangelical Lutheran congregation for the purpose of keeping and maintaining a house of worship thereon.

This conveyance became the chief ground of contention in a famous suit at law during the pastorate of Mr. Mennig, in which it was alleged that by certain usages the congregation in possession had ceased to be Lutheran, and hence was no longer entitled to hold the property, which was now claimed by a minority.

Upon the resignation of Mr. Yeager, the congregation, by the advice of the Ministerium, called two pastors, one for the Germans and the other for the English. Accordingly the Rev. Jacob Vogelbach and the Rev. Beale M. Schmucker were chosen. They came in October, 1852. The former took charge also of several country congregations. The two pastors shared the services in about equal proportions. "The contrast, however, between the audiences was very great," writes Schmucker himself in his *Historical Discourse* delivered at the twenty-fifth anniversary of St. John's Lutheran Church. "The earnestness and pulpit power of Mr. Vogelbach, then in the vigor of his best days, attracted crowded audiences. The English audiences were very small." But the work grew, so that early in 1854 measures were taken for the erection of an exclusively English Church, the

corner-stone of which was laid June 25. And the consecration of the new St. John's English Lutheran Church took place May 6, 1855.

While St. John's was building, plans for a new German Church were maturing. As early as May, 1854, a committee reported that \$7,100 had been subscribed. The final service in the old church was held on Easter, 1855. The name St. Paul's was adopted in place of German Evangelical Lutheran, May 27, 1855. The corner-stone was laid June 17, 1855, and the dedication took place Sept. 21, 1856. Drs. Mann and Hutter of Philadelphia, the Moravian Bishop Wolle of Bethlehem, and the Rev. Mr. Dubbs of the Reformed Church, assisted the pastor, Mr. Vogelbach. The cost of the edifice was about \$15,000. Mr. Vogelbach terminated his successful pastorate in February, 1857. His salary at St. Paul's was \$300.

Immediately upon the retirement of Mr. Vogelbach the congregation determined to cut loose from the country churches and support its own pastor. In the spring of 1857 the Rev. A. T. Geisserhainer became pastor at a salary of \$800, and resigned in August, 1858.

The Rev. William G. Mennig, of Pottsville, became pastor in February, 1859, at a salary of \$800, which was subsequently raised to \$1000. His preaching produced a deep spiritual impression, resulting in a genuine revival of religion. The "revival meetings," however, did not meet with the approbation of a considerable number of the members, who stigmatized the special services as "new measures." The minority, moreover, secured what appears to me the unwarranted interference of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. Hampered by the continued investigation and advice of the Ministerium, the majority party transferred the Church to the Synod of East Pennsylvania in 1872. The pastor followed the congregation in 1873. But they were not suffered to go in peace. The minority party instituted legal proceedings for the possession of the property on the plea that it was being alienated from the use and purpose for which the ground was donated in 1813. The principal charges were that the party in possession and their pastor were un-Lutheran in their practices and that the Synod, which they had joined, was not truly Lutheran. In a bitter, long, expensive and now classic trial, St. Paul's congregation, the Rev. Mr. Mennig, the East

Penna. Synod and the General Synod were completely vindicated by the findings of the Master, the decision of the Court of Common Pleas and the subsequent approval thereof by the Supreme Court..

This verdict was absolutely just; so just indeed that one of the greatest men in the Ministerium said to the writer not long ago that the Ministerium ought at this late date to rescind the action by which it disciplined Mr. Mennig. How much better would it have been for the minority to have withdrawn peacefully and to have founded another church at once. The losers in the suit organized St. Michael's church in 1875, and it is now one of the largest and most prosperous congregations in the city.

Happily the bitter contentions of a generation ago are only a memory. The pastors and the members of St. Paul's and St. Michael's regard one another as brethren. The consciousness of a common bond of blood and of faith, and the conviction of a call to do a great work as members of the one great Lutheran Church have by the grace of God healed the divisions of other days.

St. Paul's under the ministry of Father Mennig, as he was later affectionately called, attained a membership of 750. When he united with the East Pa. Synod he reported a membership of 400. Advancing years and the need of English preaching prompted him to resign in the Spring of 1877, after a pastorate of eighteen years. He remained a member of St. Paul's until his death, July 15, 1887, frequently supplying its pulpit and that of other churches. He was a man of heroic spirit and an able minister of the New Testament.

The action of a congregational meeting in October 1887, introducing the use of English in the Sunday evening service marks another era in the history of St. Paul's. A German service in the morning and an English service in the evening has been the rule for thirty-five years. The present vigorous pastor, however, now usually conducts both a German and an English service on Sunday mornings. The Sunday School has long since become English, excepting a flourishing Bible Class for the older people.

The Rev. Charles E. Hay began a successful pastorate on December 1, 1877. The membership grew from 400 to 608, and the Sunday School greatly increased, numbering 660, during

Mr. Hay's pastorate, which closed on February 10, 1890. During these twelve years a debt of \$4,200 was paid, a new pipe-organ installed at a cost of \$3000, a new parsonage was erected, and the entire congregation more thoroughly organized. The total contributions for all purposes during this pastorate was about \$42,000.

When Mr. Hay retired from St. Paul's he was accompanied by 133 members and many Sunday School scholars, and they at once organized St. Matthew's Church, on Tenth street.

The Rev. J. A. Singmaster, the next pastor, was called from Brooklyn, N. Y., and took charge May 1, 1890. St. Paul's again manifested its recuperative power in recovering from depletion in its ranks. Starting with 366 members, who remained after the exodus, the congregation as well as the Sunday School kept gaining, until at the close of a pastorate of ten years, the former numbered 640, and the latter 638. The principal improvements made during these years were the entire remodeling of the Sunday School rooms, the erection of a new building for the Primary Department, the introduction of steam and electricity, also various changes on the exterior of the church. The parsonage debt was cancelled, the regular income greatly increased, and the benevolent offerings multiplied. In his farewell discourse the retiring pastor reported that during ten years \$37,700 had been raised for current expenses, and \$11,600 for benevolence, making a total of nearly \$50,000. During the first few of these years the benevolent offerings amounted to about \$500 annually; on the tenth year they amounted to \$2,500. Mr. Singmaster retired August 31, 1900 in order to accept a professorship in the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, of which he is now the head.

The present pastor, the Rev. George A. Greiss, took charge Sept. 9, 1900. During the twelve years of his pastorate the congregation has surpassed all previous records of expansion. The confirmed membership now numbers 1137 and the Sunday School over 1000. Three young men have entered the ministry. The crowning achievement of this pastorate is the erection of the magnificent granite church, which challenges the admiration of all who see it. The old St. Paul's, with its graceful spire 190 feet in height, was dear to many a heart; but it had served its day. The new St. Paul's with its Sunday School equipment is

much superior in every way. It was built at a cost of \$92,000, exclusive of the original valuable ground. The old church was demolished in April, 1903. The corner-stone of the new building was laid Nov. 1, 1903. The Chapel and Sunday School department was dedicated Sept. 11, 1904, and the Church proper Oct. 8, 1905. The estimate value of Church and parsonage is \$230,000. During Mr. Greiss' pastorate \$240,000 have been contributed for all purposes.

During the past fifty years four congregations have gone out from St. Paul's and are now large and flourishing; and these in turn have promoted the establishment of others, so that there are to-day in and about the city twelve Lutheran Churches. These, together with Muhlenberg College, give the Lutheran Church a prominent place in this goodly town. The handful of the poor pioneers of 1762 has grown to be a great host.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE II.

THE NEW EVANGELISM.¹

BY M. H. VALENTINE, D.D.,

Editor of *The Lutheran Observer*.

Matt. 16:25. "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; whosoever will lose his life shall find it."

The choice of this text has been determined by the fact that in the progress of these memorial exercises we have reached the closing service. We have been reviewing the past, considering all the way the Lord our God hath led us. There is something in such a backward look that is immensely valuable, something to deepen faith and hope and courage. It is well to call to mind God's past faithfulness, His goodness and mercy that have followed us all our days. It heartens us for the work and struggle that lie ahead. Because God has been our help, therefore under the shadow of His wings we can still trust, believing that what has been is a pledge and promise of what shall yet be. For, in these services we are not commemorating a finished task. We are not preparing to balance the accounts and close the books and wind up the affairs of this Christian organization, as though its work were done and the word "finis" were now to be written across its history. These exercises but mark a stage in a continuing service, a pause for retrospection and gratitude in an onward march. And so it has seemed to me not inappropriate that in this final hour of these commemorative days we should face toward the future, and measure somewhat, if we can, the task that is awaiting us and the demands it will make upon us. Hence our choice of the text.

For the years as they have hurried on, have brought not only the changes that are visible to the eye—the coming and going of generations, the erection of more beautiful and imposing church buildings from time to time, the passing of the community in

¹ A sermon preached in St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Allentown, Pa., Nov. 17, 1912, on the One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the founding of the congregation.

which this congregation has done its work from the simplicities of our colonial life into the complex conditions of these modern days. A change has taken place also in our habits of mind and modes of thinking, and in our conceptions of Christian duty. Our thoughts have been widening with the process of the suns. God has been teaching us by the events of life, the unfoldings of history and the march of His providences; under the impact of these things more light and fuller has been breaking for us out of His Word. As a consequence we have not a poorer Gospel, but a richer one, instinct with larger meanings and filled with mightier and more compelling inspirations and motives.

Speaking broadly, the emphasis of the old evangelism was not put on such passages of the New Testament as the text: its burden was not lose your life but—save it! The thing stressed was the sinner's personal peril and the wisdom of making his escape from it. He was told that he was a creature on the way to hell, which yawned and hungered for him. He was pictured as one caught in the rush of a mighty river sweeping towards a precipice, from whose impetuous current, if he were carried beyond a certain point, there was no hope of rescue. A typical sermon representing this style of preaching was Jonathan Edwards' famous discourse on "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," wherein the appeal was to the sense of fear. The horrors of hell, its torments and pain, the futility of supposing that God would be moved in any least degree by the anguish of the lost to shorten or in anywise mitigate their sufferings, the brevity of life, the uncertainty as to the moment when anyone might exhaust the divine patience and cross the invisible but awful line that divides God's mercy from His wrath—these were the considerations and motives urged to persuade men to enter upon the Christian life and service. The appeal was to self-interest—a high and worthy self-interest, indeed, but still self-interest. You are on the way to ruin, but there is still hope; the day of grace has not yet closed; save yourself while you may!

And the appeal in this form shaped many of the hymns that were sung. It seemed to impart a sort of solemnity and dignity even to such crude, doggerel verses as those of Michael Wigglesworth on the terrible fate of the lost, in which our New England fathers indulged.

"They wring their hands, their catiff hands,
And gnash their teeth for terror;
They cry, they roar, for anguish sore,
And gnaw their tongues for horror."

It supplied the inspiration also for many of the better phrased hymns—hymns with which we are all familiar, such for example,

as

"Hasten, O sinner, to be wise,
And stay not for the morrow's sun;
For fear thy lamp should cease to burn,
Before the needful work is done.

Hasten, O sinner, to be blest,
And stay not for the morrow's sun;
For fear the curse should thee arrest
Before the morrow is begun."

The stress all through, you note, was put on the sinner's personal danger, and the appeal under all the variety of phrasing was still—"Save yourself."

Now, in contrast with all this, the burden of the new evangelism is "Lose yourself!" It sounds like more than a contrast. It seems like a direct contradiction, a complete displacement of the old message and the substitution of a new Gospel for the old one. But it is not. These words of Christ have always been in the New Testament. More than that, they are recorded by three of the Evangelists, an indication of the profound impression they made on the first disciples. So that in the new evangelism nothing is subtracted from the Gospel and nothing is added. It is the same evangel—only the emphasis has been shifted. What the old evangelism proclaimed with such fervor is still true. Men are sinners and out of Christ they are on the way to ruin. They need to be saved. They need to take a personal interest in their salvation. Death, judgment, heaven and hell are still realities. It is madness to procrastinate, to postpone, to defer "the great surrender." For what shall it profit a man if in his headlong pursuit of earthly aims he gains the world but loses his life? Christ asks that searching question right in connection

with our text. Unalterably and evermore it is true that we must first find our lives before we can lose them in the sense Christ had in mind—must find them in and through Him. But having found them, we must be ready to let them go. There is no other way to really find life in the sense of discovering the true, high, ennobling satisfactions it holds than through its glad surrender to duty and God in forgetfulness of self. We can never find that abundant life of which Christ spoke by making it the direct object of our quest. It is the meed and reward of pursuing other ends. It is like happiness. "Those only are happy," wrote John Stuart Mill—and his words are everlastingly true—"who have their minds fixed on some other object than their own happiness; on the happiness of others, on the improvement of mankind, even on some art or pursuit followed not as a means but as itself an ideal end. Aiming thus at something else, they find happiness by the way."

It is like honor, the esteem and affection of our fellowmen and the blessed sense of God's favor. They become ours not by making them the direct end and object of our seeking. We come upon them, if at all, by going straight forward in the path of simple right and duty. That is the truth Tennyson has set to the music of his verse in his lines on the death of Wellington:

"Not once or twice in our rough island story
The path of duty was the way to glory;
He that walks it, only thirsting
For the right, and learns to deaden
Love of self, before his journey closes
He shall find the stubborn thistles bursting
Into glossy purples, which outredden
All voluptuous garden roses.

Not once or twice in our fair island story
The path of duty was the way to glory;
He that ever following her commands,
On with toil of heart and knees and hands,
Through the long gorge to the far light has won
His path upwards and prevailed,
Shall find the toppling crags of duty scaled
Are close upon the shining tablelands
To which our God is moon and sun."

And so on every side experience furnishes analogies of the text—that we find life only by losing it, that the men and women whose lives have depth, richness, fulness of satisfaction, are those who accept the law of sacrifice and service. Christ himself did. He did not count His life, any more than His equality with God, as a prize to be guarded and retained at all cost. He gave it away—gave it a ransom for many, and in losing it found it again a hundredfold in the joy of bringing many sons to glory. The man to whom self is the aim and goal of life's endeavor, who thinks of self-preservation first, who is determined to hold on to his life whatever else has to go, who lives in the senses rather than in the spirit, forfeits the highest gifts that life can bestow. There goes on within him a terrible process of decay—the decay of all the higher and finer instincts. His soul shrivels. His heart becomes ever narrower, more contracted and impoverished. He perishes from the center outward.

“Who seeks for heaven alone to save his soul
May keep the path, but will not reach the goal,
While he who walks in love may wander far,
But God will bring him where the blessed are.”

And so the new evangelism is not perverting the original message of Christ when for the appeal, “Save your life,” it substitutes, “Lose your life and you shall find it.” It is only a fuller appreciation of the total meaning and teaching and of the Gospel that is involved in this shifting of emphasis. It means stressing elements that have always been there, but which have been too much neglected. Wilberforce had appreciated them. Immersed in his work of freeing the slave, a woman once admonished him that he was in danger of losing his soul. “Madam,” he replied, “I almost forgot I have a soul.” It was not, as it might seem, a sinking of the spiritual and eternal in temporal and humanitarian interests. It was religion carried on and up into the spirit of the text. His life was steeped in religion, so steeped in it that it had caught religion's divine passion, its spirit of sacrifice and service, its embodied expression of the mind of Christ who saved not himself that he might save others.

And as the old evangelism found place in our hymnology, so

the new is expressing itself in sacred songs, like this one of Washington Gladden's, for example:

"O Master, let me walk with Thee
In lowly paths of service free;
Tell me Thy secret, help me bear
The strain of toil, the fret of care.

Help me the slow of heart to move
By some clear winning word of love;
Teach me the wayward feet to stay,
And guide them in the heavenward way.

Teach me Thy patience; still with Thee
In closer, dearer company;
In faith that keeps faith sweet and strong,
In trust that triumphs over wrong."

It is in this new emphasis which, for convenience sake, I have elected to call the "new evangelism," that we have a harbinger of hope in these days of wide-spread alienation of masses of people from the Church. That alienation has been due in no small measure, we believe, to the failure to stress, as the Gospel stresses it, the truth that men are saved to serve; that the Church is not simply a hospital for coddling spiritual valetudinarians and comforting them with the assurance of a final salvation, personal, individualistic and selfish; but that the Church is the divine instrumentality for realizing the answer to the prayer, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven"--a prayer, as you observe, for the hastening of the day when the whole life of mankind, individual and corporate, shall respond to the truth and holiness of God, and when society in all its immense complex, the family, the State, the Nation, the industrial and economic system, the fellowship of letters and art, and all the other energies of men shall be penetrated from center to circumference with a sense of the service of God, and when righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost shall furnish the modes and motives of their thought and action. A Church imbued with this conception of its mission and function, and trying to live up to it in all its activities, will make an irresistible appeal to multitudes who are now alienated from it. Ears that have been deaf to the

cry, "Save your life," will hear the nobler summons, "Lose your life—lose it in the splendid, inspiring, enthusiasm of unselfish service for God and the world." It is the appeal to the heroic—an appeal which has never failed to evoke a response. You remember how the heart of Young Italy answered to it. "Men, I have not called you to pleasure," were the burning words of Garibaldi to the men who flocked to his standard, in the long fight for Italian liberty, and unity, "If you go with me, you will not have an easy time. I cannot promise you wealth or comfort. No, I call you to war, to long marches, to hunger and weariness, to discomforts a thousandfold, to fightings and even to death. Will you come with me on these terms for our country's sake?" And they answered him with a mighty, "We will!" It is to the appeal which Christ himself makes, "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me, for whosoever would save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it."

Among the most inspiring phenomena in the life of the Church to-day is the Student's Volunteer Movement, a movement that has already sent some of the brightest and best young men in our colleges and universities into the foreign fields and has enrolled hundreds of others who are ready to go. The appeal that reached their consciences, kindled their enthusiasm and fired their hearts was not the selfish one, "Save your life," but the heroic one, "Lose it, for Christ's sake and the Gospel's."

Even the world has caught the glory of the appeal. Seldom have we had a finer illustration of it than was furnished a few weeks ago by the Gary, Ind., newsboy, William Rugh. He had a useless leg, and he consented to its amputation that the skin might be grafted on the limbs of a young girl who had been burned, whom he had seen only once in his life. He was told of the danger and possible death that would result from the operation, and with full comprehension of the gravity of the act he made the sacrifice. "What's the odds," he said, "if it will save her life? Go ahead and cut it off." He lived long enough to see the girl go from the hospital cured, and then succumbed to pneumonia from the irritation of the ether. No wonder the great steel mills of Gary closed down on the day of the boy's funeral, and that the mayor and council of the city walked bare-headed at the front of the procession, in which four bands played

solemn dirges, and that a memorial tablet will adorn the walls of the hospital where he laid down his life that another might live.

The same thing in some form is happening all the while. Only a few weeks before the papers told the pathetic story of William Rugh, the "Outlook" recited that of Passed Assistant Surgeon, Dr. Thomas Brown McClintic, of the Public Health Service. For many years past in the States of the Rocky Mountains there has appeared a strange disease, due to wood-tick, which every spring claimed a fresh and increasing toll of victims. It was called the Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever. Thomas Brown McClintic was a Virginian, of good, clean stock, a graduate in medicine of the University of Virginia in 1896. In the spring of last year he was sent into the Bitter Root Valley, the place of the fever's greatest virulence, to study, and if possible, eradicate the disease by eradicating its cause. He moved into the infected district, knowing well that he was taking his life in his hands. He became the leading authority on tick-fever. He did valuable work in search of a curative or preventive serum. In March of this year he was married, and soon thereafter returned with his bride to the perilous valley to be ready for the tick season. In mid-summer he was stricken with the dreaded disease and died. But no other case of spotted fever developed in the Bitter Root Valley this year. He had driven out the pestilence, but as it went, it struck down its conqueror. And evermore this thing is happening, as McClintic's biographer goes on to say. "Yellow-fever, small-pox, typhoid, plague, cholera, have taken their toll from the ranks of their foes. But the ranks close up, and the fight goes on that our world may become a cleaner, better, safer place for men to dwell in."

Now it is not a matter for complaint and criticism that the world has caught this divine spirit of service, and is practicing it, not only in fighting disease, but in countless forms of philanthropy that aim to minister to the appalling record of men and women and children overtaken by misfortune and enmeshed in evil conditions from which they cannot extricate themselves. My only criticism is that it does not acknowledge the source of its noble inspirations. It borrows, but withholds credit. It is one of the puzzles of the time why so many men and women who are doing these mighty works, do them outside the Church and not as her loyal children. Is it because, while furnishing the

dynamic energy for all this multiform unselfish service, she has hesitated too much and too long to apply it in her own name and right, content still to cry, "Save your life," but not ready to proclaim that the only way to really save it is to lose it? With his eye on these manifold forms of unselfish services which are being carried on to-day by men and women who are not formally connected with the Church, Bishop Williams, of the Episcopal Church, recently wrote: "The religion of to-day has grown and expanded until it finds the walls of the home in which it was born too narrow and confining for its spirit. And it bursts out of doors into the open fields of intellectual research, moral welfare and social service, while the Church stays indoors, absorbed in the reek of her incense, the bustle of her rites and the preaching of her orthodoxies." It will be in proclaiming the new evangel, that the way to save one's life is to lose it, that she will come again into her own, and the energies for service which she generates will work in her own name and under her own sanctions.

One winter morning in 1908, so the story runs as related in *The Churchman*, a few weeks ago, the Rev. Dr. Floyd Tomkins, rector of Holy Trinity Church, Philadelphia, was in his study when a visitor was announced, Mr. Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, who at once made known the purpose of his visit. "I have come to see you as my pastor, Dr. Tomkins. I have seen the Great Light and I am going to try to lead a Christian life." Dr. Tomkins looked at the speaker in amazement. "He had long known 'Tony Biddle' as a society leader in the city's most fashionable and exclusive set, a scion of an old and distinguished family, a man of great wealth and great generosity, a noted traveler and a Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society of London, a patron of literature and author of a number of books, a club man, an all-round athlete, a boxer of wonderful skill, and gameness, a lover of all manly sports, a man of irreproachable personal character, but a thorough man of the world, whose whole life hitherto had been spent in a round of amusement and pleasure." There was a class in the Sunday School that had dwindled to three members after the departure of its teacher as a missionary to China. Dr. Tomkins thought of this class and quietly said: "Mr. Biddle, there is a Bible class of three young men who have no teacher. See what you can do for them." Neither of the men dreamed of

the results that would follow from that short interview. Mr. Biddle could not foresee that he had entered on his life-work. "He had no plan in view, no theories to work out. He simply felt that as part of a real Christian life he must give not only of his means but of himself in personal service for the uplift of his fellowmen." It was a small beginning, but it was the beginning of a work destined to widen in influence and interest until now a chain of Drexel-Biddle-Bible-Classes in the various Evangelical Churches extends across the Middle States with more to follow; a work that in less than five years has come to "dominate his life and absorb practically all his time and energy and fill his soul with an intensity of happiness he had never before deemed possible."

As a matter of fact, the way in which men to-day are seeking to cultivate a keener sense of the presence of God is not by indulging a morbid self-solicitude, or by sitting before an image of Christ and contemplating his five wounds until, as in the legends of mediaeval saints, they bear the marks of those wounds in their own bodies; nor are they attempting to realize it by interminable striving after exact and final formulations of dogma, nor by concentrating their efforts on elaborating imposing rituals or ecclesiastical politics, nor by putting in the forefront of their concern the problem of how to save their own lives. They are trying to come into a fuller realization of the Divine Presence by throwing themselves into those forms of Christian service that proceed on the assumption that we are members one of another, thus getting into nearer fellowship with the Father by fellowship in service, with and for members of His household. We serve God in serving our fellowmen and we cannot serve them by getting away from them. Neither can we get closer to God in that way. "Whoever wants to find God will find Him quickest where He has set His image and breathed His breath—in the great family of His human children."

"The parish priest
Of Austerlitz
Climbed up a high church steeple
To be nearer God,
So that he might hand
His word down to his people.

And in sermon script
He daily wrote
What he thought was sent from heaven,
And he dropped this down
On his people's heads
Two times one day in seven.

In his age God said
'Come down and die.'
And he cried out from the steeple,
'Where art thou, Lord?'
And the Lord replied
'Down here among my people.'"

"I shall always remember," writes Dr. Charles Reynolds Brown, in his "Social Message of the Modern Pulpit," "a serious talk I had with an intelligent Christian layman in an eastern city. His father and grandfather had been Congregational ministers, and he was himself an active member of one of the churches there. He enjoyed regularly and gratefully the ministrations of one of the most spiritually minded pastors in that city. He was telling me of the Christian work in which he had been engaged the winter before. He had been working with a group of men to compel certain landlords to make the tenement houses they owned more sanitary. Together these men had been securing the enforcement of the law against certain infamous dens which were a constant menace to the morals of the poor boys and girls who lived in the vicinity. They had been accomplishing something in finding employment for men out of work, for it was during an era of hard times. They had succeeded in securing through a free market a cheaper and more wholesome food supply for the poor. They had been co-operating in the work of a certain Social Settlement which supervises a number of boys clubs and sewing schools and workingmen's resorts, bringing cheer and hope to hundreds of neglected lives. He had found a deep satisfaction in the part he had taken in it all, and as he concluded his narrative he leaned across the table and said to me with the utmost earnestness: 'You know I get nearer my Lord in working for these struggling people down there than I ever do in our own church prayermeetings.' He was a man who could

and did take an effective hand in the prayer-meeting too, but he had found his way into a deeper realization of the Divine Spirit in his unselfish service to the needs of that section of the city rather than in the usual conventional efforts after spirituality. Inasmuch as ye have sympathetically and helpfully known the least of these, his brethren, ye have known him."

The contrast between the attitude to which the old evangelism spoke and that to which the new addresses itself is exhibited in two illustrations from life. The one is of the long ago—a young man, rich, cultured, moral, who eagerly came to Christ with the question, "How can I save my life?" Instantly the Master detected the wrong emphasis that constituted so much of the burden of the old evangelism and instantly, too, he put his finger on the weak spot, telling him to look away from himself, to follow the rule of the text, to lose his life if he wanted to save it. "Go sell that thou hast and give to the poor." And the young man went away sorrowful.

The other illustration is from modern life—that of William Whiting Borden, who a few weeks ago was ordained before the pulpit in Chicago from which Dwight L. Moody preached so many years ago. Here was another young man, like the first, rich, cultured, moral, a graduate of Yale University and of Princeton Seminary, heir to an estate of millions. He will spend this winter talking to college students under the auspices of the Student Volunteer Movement. Afterwards he will take a course in medicine and spend two years in studying the Chinese language; then he will enter on his life-work with the China Inland Mission in the province of Kansu, where Mohammedanism is potent. Already at Yale he had established at his own expense a \$20,000 student's mission, which he also conducted, and this is still to be carried on by subsidies from his purse. So, that, even in its beginnings, without reference to what may be ahead in the way of sacrifice and even death itself, his is a sublime self-surrender, a hearty, whole-souled acceptance of the spirit of the new evangelism, which is nothing more, neither is it anything less, than the preaching and practice of the rule of the text, that if we would gain life we must be willing to lose it.

The spirit to which the old evangelism spoke asks with the rich young ruler of the Gospel, "How can I save my life?" and with Peter before Pentecost, "What shall we have?"; that to which

the new addresses itself asks with Paul, "What wilt thou have me to do?" and with William Whiting Borden and Wilfred Grenfell the apostle to the Labrador, "How and where can I best serve God and my fellowmen." The one is egoistic; the other altruistic. The one is purely selfish and personal; the other unselfish and social. The one is the old question of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" the other is the spirit that calls all men brothers and self their servant for Christ's sake.

"In the Lord's Prayer," it has been well said, "the words 'I' and 'my' and 'me' nowhere occur. The individual considering himself, and praying for herself, all apart from any sympathetic interest in others never has a chance to be heard in that ideal prayer: 'Our Father,' 'Give us this day our daily bread,' 'Forgive us, lead us, deliver us.' It is the utterance of a warm heart looking out and looking up, strongly possessed with the desire to help. The petitioner casts in his need with the rest, seeking to gain his individual help through the services he renders to those whose needs, equally with his own, are contemplated in the social terms of this incomparable prayer."

We are firmly persuaded that the future growth and prosperity of every Christian congregation depends upon the heartiness with which it enters into the unselfish spirit of that prayer, the degree in which it preaches and practices the truth that if we would save our life we must be willing to lose it. Always that truth has had its place in the Gospel as we have received the same from Christ; and always the Church has proclaimed it. But not always with the emphasis it has deserved, nor with a sufficiently keen apprehension of its vital place in the plan and way of salvation, or of its decisive bearing on some of the vast problems that confront institutional Christianity in the world. It is the new stressing of it that makes it seem like a fresh discovery. God grant that its profound significance may take full possession of your hearts. A blessing is in it, a blessing for yourselves, for this community in which for a century and a half you have labored as a congregation of believers, and a blessing also for the world.

May God guide and direct you as from the retrospective services of this happy week you turn to confront the future, big with its tasks and solemn with its responsibilities. And may the joy of the Lord be your strength as you take up again the welcome burden of service for God and your fellowmen.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ARTICLE III.

THE KIND OF PREACHING THAT I LIKE.

A LAYMAN'S SYMPOSIUM.

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—About three months ago one of the editors of the QUARTERLY wrote to twenty well known laymen, in different parts of the Church, inviting each one of them to contribute a brief paper to a symposium on the subject which stands at the head of this article. The object in view was two-fold. In the first place it was desired to give some of our most intelligent laymen an opportunity to express their views on a subject in which they must be deeply interested, but on which they seldom have a chance to speak. In the second place it was believed that in this way some valuable suggestions might come to those who preach. At least it would be interesting to know what the pew expects from the pulpit.

It is to be regretted that of the twenty invited to contribute to the symposium, only eight were willing to respond and to become "professors" in what one of them very aptly calls "this Lay College of Homiletics for Preachers and Theologues." However these eight papers may be regarded as fairly representative coming, as they do, from lawyers, physicians, and practical business men, living in different sections of the Church all the way from New York City to San Diego, California.

Several things are deserving of special note in these papers. One is the kindly tone of all of them towards the ministry. There is not a single harsh word or unkind criticism. Another is the remarkable unanimity of sentiment expressed. Widely separated in residence as the writers are, and no one knowing who else was to write, there was no possibility of collusion. Yet they could hardly have been more in agreement if they had held a conference in advance and determined what each one should say. But the most noteworthy thing of all is the fact that every one "likes" plain, simple, gospel sermons. As one expresses it so admirably, "It is the plain, simple gospel truth, expressed in plain, simple language, enlightening the mind, awakening the

conscience, engaging the affections, that stirs the soul, that pleases the most."

It will be encouraging to every earnest gospel preacher to know that this is the feeling of our most intelligent laymen. It should be especially remembered by our younger ministers in these days when so many are turning aside from a simple gospel to preach ethics, and economics, and social science, and politics, and almost anything and everything but the gospel of Christ.)

I.

BY L. RUSSELL ALDEN, ESQ.

I like a gospel sermon. I do not go to Church to learn of Shakespeare or Browning or to see and hear an illustrated lecture on "How the Other Half Live." I go to Church to worship God and to receive a message from and about Him. Not that I would have my pastor exclude from his discourse all illustration drawn from the world's great literature, for a quotation from some classic or an allusion to some event therein portrayed oftentimes illuminates a subject for me far more than would an hour's plain exposition. Nor would I be blind to the wretchedness that attends the poverty-stricken, the ignorant and the unfortunate, or unsympathetic to movements for improvement in the social condition of the people or the government of the community. But I hold that the mission of the Church is not to entertain the public or to lead it in civic reform, but to save men's souls and draw and keep them close to God, and that, if it does this well, the social life of the people will continue to be transformed, as it has been in the past, by the leaven thus introduced, and the social evils of the day will vanish as the number increases of those who live under the teachings of the Gospel.

I like a sermon to be logical. I want it to follow some definite outline and to follow it so clearly that I will have no difficulty in recognizing the argument. I do not derive much good from a sermon made up of a mere collection of unrelated thoughts seemingly ordered much as the Mohammedan Koran, by shaking them all up together and arranging them consecutively as they come out. Religious oratory, to be effective, must meet the same literary demands as secular oratory, and none of the great speeches of

the world—the speeches that have moved men to action and made their impress on the ages—left their hearers in any doubt as to what was the theme of the address or the argument intended to be made upon it.

Finally, I like a sermon to be brief, that is about twenty-five minutes in the morning and fifteen minutes at night. Not that I think so little of God's message that I want to get through with hearing it in the least time possible. But because I want, not only to hear the message, but to carry it away with me. Now, the human mind is such that its attention can not be kept *concentrated* on any one kind of matter, serious or comic, for longer than a brief while. If that possible period is passed and no relief in change of matter is affected, the mind will seek its own relief in unconscious inattention or attention to something else. The great orators and writers of the world have recognized this and governed themselves accordingly. That is why, in Shakespeare for instance, scenes of deepest and tensest tragedy are so often followed by the entrance of fools and jesters with empty-headed clatter. English teachers call this "tone-relief." And a preacher can not be blind to its need if he wishes his message to stay with his hearers, guiding and cheering and strengthening them still, when they have passed from the Church edifice with its sacred influences and are out in the busy world of care and strife, where a man needs his God with him every minute to help him lead a Christian life. And so, let the message be brief, that it may be lasting.

Washington, D. C.

II.

BY MR. HARRY TENNYSON DOMER, A.M.

Before venturing upon the thin ice of this symposium, this "Lay College of Homiletics for Preachers and Theologues," permit me to say that my pastor, if you know him, is in no wise responsible for any advanced ideas or heretical doctrines which I may here pronounce. He is one of the best men in the world and has striven earnestly to inculcate in me a refined taste and sober, orthodox judgment. My sins, therefore, are not on his head,

though, no doubt, they have often weighed heavily upon his heart.

Also, I must ask you to pardon the first person and direct speech. It may seem egotistical and opinionated, but the subject is personal and the discussion should be likewise. Candidly I like the topic for that reason, it *is* personal, it *is* direct. I talk to you as I would have you talk to me, right to the point, as man to man, no beating around the bush. In a word, that is the kind of preaching that I like, whether in the pulpit, in the office, or on the street. It reaches *home*.

I have heard men complain that the preachers do not "play ball," that they do not get down to practical things, that their sermons are way over the heads of the people. There is nothing that appeals to men more strongly (and I include myself in the number) than a plain, straightforward, Gospel sermon. The Old Book is the most practical book in the world, and its exposition should conform to it.

Beware of pedantry! If you have philosophical fads or psychological fancies, keep them for Conference, or better, for the study. Plato and Aristotle, Kant, Hegel and Spencer, have no place in the pulpit. There it must be Christ alone, "and Him crucified."

"Faith is not built on disquisitions vain,
The things we must believe are few and plain."

A pastor should know his flock. He should minister to their needs. I do not go to Church to be entertained. I do not go to be taught. But I do go to worship God and to be helped by His service. For instance, I may be discouraged and depressed, inspiration is gone, sorrow has come and I suffer keenly. I want to get away from the drossy things of life, from its hardness and its coldness. I yearn for a word of comfort and cheer, I long for rest and quietness, for that "peace which passeth understanding." Where shall I get it? Should not every sermon, no matter what the text, have a message of hope, of inspiration, of comfort for all?

Sermons, also, should be appropriate to the season. They usually do correspond with the Church seasons, Christmas, Easter, etc., but not always with the calendar. For instance,

last summer I heard a minister preach a red-hot sermon on "Fire" when the thermometer was registering ninety in the shade! It was not refreshing! Why could he not have led us where our thoughts were, and where we longed to be, along "green pastures" and "beside the still waters"?

I also like "occasional" sermons, those that present the spiritual aspect of important events, anniversaries, calamities, etc. The Church is thus brought into intimate contact with the daily life of the people, showing them the o'er-ruling hand of God in the affairs of men.

No long sermons! When Woodrow Wilson, then President of Princeton, was asked by a visiting clergyman if there was a time limit to the chapel discourse, he replied, "No, but there is a tradition among the students that no souls are saved after the first twenty minutes." The average church member probably has more endurance than the average college student, but I doubt if many souls are saved after the first half hour.

Keep in touch with literature, the master thinkers and writers, the masters of language and form. "Give days and nights, sir," said Samuel Johnson, "to the study of Addison, if you mean to be a good writer." My own motto is, "Read John Hay"; though I regret that his disciple is so unworthy.

Read poetry also. The preacher and the poet are kin. Each has a message, each "looks deep into the tangled mysteries of things." Much of inspired scripture is in this form. Half of our service is poetry. How Christ loved the fields and the hills and the sea! How He drew upon them for parable, illustration and truth! "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handiwork." The lover of nature

"Finds tongues in trees, books in running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything."

No manuscript! The minister tied to his paper is a slave, bound hand and foot. There is no message, or at least a very impersonal one. Freedom, power, inspiration, fire, the play of mind upon mind, heart upon heart, soul upon soul, that vital, personal contact so necessary between speaker and audience, are lost, all dissipated by that paralyzing sheet before him. The reader may be an elocutionist, he may even be a good preacher,

as far as sermons go, but he will never be a pulpit orator, never a great moral and religious crusader.

Dr. James B. Angell, President Emeritus of the University of Michigan, says, in his recent "Reminiscences": (While professor at Brown University, 1853-59) "I was called on at various times to give lectures in and near Providence. I first wrote out some lectures and read them. I soon found that this was not the most effective mode of lecturing, and moreover that it made too great a draught on my throat. So I decided to throw away manuscript. I thus acquired the habit of speaking without notes, which I have followed through my life with few exceptions and then against my wishes. Many of my speeches I have after delivery reduced to writing in order to preserve them; but the pleasure and effectiveness of speaking without reading can never be equalled by reading a manuscript."

Speak loud! If you cannot be heard, why preach at all? Every unintelligible word is that much lost. To be impressive, one does not have to be inaudible.

One of the most important parts of the service is the reading of the Scriptures, but it is a part very often neglected. The lesson should be read clearly and distinctly. Don't mumble, don't hurry. That is all the Bible many of your people get. If it is not worth doing well, it is not worth doing at all. Be animated in delivery. Be interested in your own words or nobody else will be so. Oh the crime of sing-songing the glorious truths of Scripture! An actor studies every word and syllable of his lines. He studies them to bring out their fullest stress and meaning. Is it not as important for the minister to take as many pains with the Word of God?

Washington, D. C.

III.

BY MR. P. A. ELSESSER.

I like preaching that is both spiritual and practical, if there is such a thing as having one without the other. As a christian I have never been much interested in a sermon concerning my future existence but have always been touched with an earnest

appeal to do the best I could do, with God's help, here in this life.

I don't care for a sermon, or so-called lecture, on a subject which deals with material things and has no spiritual application. I love a sermon which uplifts Christ and helps to keep the Cross before me.

As for myself, a sermon which is not replete with the gospel of Christ and the power of God to save me, with others, and help me to live a life of usefulness and helpfulness, does not give me that which I need from week to week.

As to the delivery, I have always been more interested in natural, extemporaneous preaching than in a carefully read sermon, and especially so if in reading the preacher is obliged to confine himself closely to his manuscript. However, I prefer a well read sermon to a carelessly prepared rambling, extemporaneous exhortation.

My training for more than twenty years in business, has been for directness and efficiency and I love the preaching that directs me to do things and points me to the source of power that will enable me to do them in the most efficient and practical manner. Preaching which reminds me that there is something for me to do, and helps to lay the responsibility upon me I feel I need.

York, Pa.

IV.

BY P. S. LEISENRING, M. D.

Preaching to my mind; is the teaching of God's word from the pulpit; to a promiscuous audience. I like to have the sermon delivered in a distinct voice, in an impressive, simple manner, as if the speaker understood his subject, and wished to impress its truth upon the minds and hearts of his hearers.

"Dogmatic?" Me thinks I hear you ask.

Yes; somewhat so, if the subject and occasion demand it. Yet, I consider no sermon complete unless it centers around the *Christ*.

To my mind, too much preaching nowadays is not founded on the Bible—but on political, scientific, socialistic or popular subjects. No preacher of this kind for me, except incidentally re-

ferred to for illustrating the subject under consideration. Usually the ordinary audience understands such questions as well as, if not better, than the speaker himself. Again the discussing of these matters accomplishes no good, but does harm, I attend church services to be instructed out of the Word; to learn of my duty to Jehovah, my neighbor and myself—Sensational sermons may answer for a short while and draw the curious hearer,—but usually they are short lived. I have never known services founded on anything but God's Word, to result in any permanent good—no preaching for me from Shakespeare, Tennyson, the Bonnie Briar Bush, and such like—in place of the Bible. Yet, we have ministers of the gospel who select texts from such authors. In the absence of my pastor I visited a neighboring church expecting to hear a sermon. In the place of preaching there was a *moving picture show of Naples*, including dancing girls and all. I left the church before its close. "I asked for bread and he gave me a stone." How many souls were benefited by that Sunday evening service, think you? Paul 1 Corin. 1-17 says, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to *preach the gospel*; not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made on none effect." To my mind, never before in the history of our land did we need plain, pungent gospel preaching as we do now.

San Diego, California.

V.

BY GEO. E. NEFF, ESQ.

I have been asked to state "the kind of preaching that I like." This may be done by both negative and positive statements.

First: The kind of preaching that I do *not* like is one that is filled unduly with vain repetitions, both of words and ideas; or that attempts to feed a man's soul with the husks of sensationalism, or even an undue dwelling upon what is popularly known as "Topics of the Times"; or that is too timid or cowardly to denounce sin in any and every form, for fear of offending, forsooth, the most prominent family or the largest contributor in the Church.

Second: The kind of preaching that I like is stated in a few

words: Simple, direct, fearless, and above all, preaching Christ and Him crucified as the only Saviour of Mankind.

York, Pa.

VI.

BY GEO. B. REIMENSNYDER, ESQ.

"The Kind of Preaching That I Like," is that which is the expression of the conviction of the one who is preaching. It is a message from God's Word, and is the result not only of the intellectual attainments of the speaker, but also of his life as lived by him. The leading truths of the Gospel, its precepts, promises and threatenings, are the grand theme of the preaching. It is made practical and is always scriptural. It shows us God's interest in us: that he has a place, and a plan for each of us; that we have sinned and been redeemed. It holds up Christ as the Son of God (Deity) as our Redeemer, and makes plain the plan of salvation; that we must make choice, and live accordingly: that our choice means eternal life or eternal death. It portrays the passion of God and Christ for the saving of mankind. It points out our privileges and our duties as Christians, and how to make use of those privileges and to perform those duties, backed up by the authority of God's word, so that I am instructed and built up for life's great work, its conflicts, its trials, its temptations.

I like a short introduction, giving a birds-eye view of the context: a strong thought to arouse attention, followed by the presentation of the proposition, and then the application. The discourse not longer than twenty-five or thirty minutes at the most. It must be adapted to the hearers' ability to comprehend, and must apply to the spiritual state of the hearers, their sins, their temptations, etc. I do not like that preaching which is unique, at the expense of that quiet dignity which marks the production of the profound thinker and reasoner. I enjoy an intellectual sermon but I realize that it is not always the profoundest production nor the clearest most cogent reasoning of the preaching that is liked the best by the masses or does the most good. Sometimes, the preaching is so profound, and the thought so deep that it tires one to follow it. It is the plain simple gospel truth, expressed in

plain simple language, enlightening the mind, awakening the conscience, engaging the affections, that stirs the soul, that pleases the most, and which leaves the lasting impression, that inspires one to do that which is so expressed as to enable one to grasp it quickly, absorb and assimilate it, and carry it out in daily practice. Preaching, with an occasional story or anecdote to aptly illustrate the subject, is appreciated by me, but preaching made up of stories or of anecdotes goes against the grain with me—nor do I like antics in the pulpit. I like a natural graceful delivery, the speaker having forgotten himself, in the presentation of his theme. I like a voice soft, persuasive and full of pathos, flowing from a heart full of affection and sympathy. Pleading for the cause, rather than harsh denunciation, which illy becomes the pulpit.,I do not like violent demonstrations in the pulpit, either with mouth, hands or feet. In my humble opinion many a good sermon is ruined by too harsh language or too violent demonstration and apparent indignation. I like that earnestness and enthusiasm as the speaker warms to his subject, which results in a gradual rise of the voice, until the climax is reached. A sudden outcry and just as sudden a lowering of the voice annoy me. I do not like that preaching which deals solely with secular matters as such. I like that preaching which keeps abreast of the times "and that is in touch with the great movements that today are moving like God's breath on the face of the earth," and which is always subordinated to the Word of God. I cannot endure politics in the pulpit. However, I like the pulpit to back up great moral reforms from the stand point of religion. I cannot endure a pessimistic view of the state of religion in the world. I like optimistic, hopeful preaching. The world is far better today than it ever was. The pulpit and the church are stronger, more efficient and more thoroughly at work than ever.

Sunbury, Pa.

VII.

BY MR. I. SEARLES RUNYON.

To meet my needs sermons must do three things. They must furnish inspiration to religious devotion and piety, provide ade-

quate instruction in religion, and afford somewhat of guidance in the outward and practical expression of religion.

Line upon line and precept upon precept the sermons of the years must lay in the succeeding generations of men the groundwork of moral character and help to sustain the spiritual life that has been planted. Sin, and salvation by grace must ever be the themes, the Law and the Gospel must ever be the basis of pulpit work.

I am glad that but few Lutheran preachers have yielded to the supposed popular fancy for sermons on purely ethical, altruistic, or other semi-secular topics, but that they have kept clearly in mind the fact that religion is the basis of good morals and have been satisfied to set forth the foundation upon which each man in the pew can rear the structure of his daily life for himself. I have slight patience with that kind of "preaching" (?), less popular today than in the recent past, which seemed to be based upon the assumption that the men in the pews need to be shadowed by a monitor. I want to hear sermons that set forth principles, clarify fundamental moral laws, and otherwise help a man to be his own monitor, and then furnish something of inspiration to live up to the dictates of his strengthened and enlightened judgment.

But the sermons of a year's series must present a practical interpretation of religion, because after all religion is practical and finds expression in outward life.

A Roman Catholic bishop, in an address to a class of boys about to take confirmation vows, is reported to have said recently that "the Roman Catholic Church is organized to fight the world." While it is true in a sense that the true Christian Church must and does fight the world, it is equally true that in another, and in these days perhaps larger sense the true Christian Church must not and does not fight the world. So largely in numbers and fairly in spirit has "the world" become Christianized that to say the Church is "fighting" the world exposes the Church to the danger of being misunderstood by the world, and of needlessly lengthening the time that must be taken to evangelize the world. "In the world" but "not of the world" involves sympathy with all its people, and an effort to understand their mind, help them to get hold of a better rule of life and to correct their faults. To do this the Church must today assume a very different attitude

towards the world from that she took a thousand years ago. The world itself has changed and with it have changed the battle lines. The temper and practice of the people in Christian countries are essentially Christian, and though not all the people are churchmen, so much are they, in heart and habit, the product of Christianity that it would be folly for the Church to "fight" them, in the popular sense of that word. And the preacher must give the churchman some practical help to live rightly among these people. He must help him to translate to them the Christian religion in the language of life. He must portray the ideal life on earth just as surely and as truly as he furnishes glimpses of the life in heaven. The preacher who omits the practical application of religion to the social and industrial life of the time denies the truth of the statements "Ye are the light of the world," "Ye are the salt of the earth."

As religion is primarily a matter of love, the sermon which appeals to me most strongly is framed in a manner to play somewhat upon the emotions. In it there are word pictures of the ideal in spirit and life, appeals to the imagination and to sentiment, for portrayals of grace and beauty in nature and super-nature. But the emotional element really corresponds to the flavor in the material food. The appeals to the mind and the deeper soul faculty form the real substance upon which we depend for spiritual nourishment, hence the body of the sermon is plain, unvarnished statement of truth, forced home by application and occasional illustration.

To make sure the right balance of the elements of the sermon, and still get the benefit of the preacher's personal power, I like to hear the sermon delivered from manuscript partly committed to memory.

New York.

VIII.

BY WILLIAM C. STOEVER, ESQ.

"The kind of preaching that I like" might not be to the liking of every person. My preference is for a sermon which deals with the things of every day life, the sins; the obstacles, the difficulties in all our relations in life, the way to be rid of burdens or to bear

them, and the peace which comes from perfect trust in Jesus Christ as our Redeemer and elder brother. I care not for discussions, dissertations, philosophical essays, scientific conjectures, or civic or political themes. Men of this world are not drawn to Church to listen to preaching if it be in the line of anything else but Jesus Christ, and the comfort which comes from faith in Him. The newspapers of to-day are filled with such topics during the six laboring days of the week as make a man feel that one day of rest from these disturbing elements is beneficial in building a strong manhood, and in preparation to meet the annoyances of business and life. A sermon with heads and an application, with points clearly stated, appeals to me. It is easy to present an essay but difficult to prepare a sermon plain, simple, so that a child, or "a wayfaring man though a fool" may understand.

We talk of our many and serious problems; but they will not be met by sermons which do not teach men how to live, both for God and their fellowmen. The Church is failing to reach the suffering masses because its members are not reminded continually of their duty, and of their neglect to follow the Lord's command, to love Him with all their heart, and to love their neighbor as themselves.

One of our magazines is publishing a serial entitled "The Inside of the Cup," which is revealing the weakness of our Churches, and the failure of pastors and people to do their whole duty as set forth in God's Word. When we have men taught in our Seminaries to know and love men, and to preach to us our duty as set forth in the Epistle of St. James, 1:27, then will we have a Church not only able but willing to do its duty in reaching men.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ARTICLE IV.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE BEGINNING OF
FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE.¹

BY H. M. J. KLEIN.

NOTE.—This article is reprinted from *The Reformed Church Review* by permission of the editors and of the author. It is of interest to Lutherans, because originally their control of Franklin College was equal to that of the Reformed. Its first president and one of the professors were Lutherans. The article chronicles the story of its precarious existence during its early years, and the hopes concerning it as a union school were never realized. As late as 1819 the Ministerium of Pennsylvania "*Resolved*, that a committee on our part be appointed to meet at the next Reformed Synod at Lancaster, with a committee of the same, to prepare a plan for a Theological Seminary." This plan was prepared and submitted in 1820. The original draft, in the handwriting of S. S. Schmucker, is preserved in the Archives of the Ministerium. In the same year the General Synod was formed, and at its first convention appointed a committee to devise a plan for the organization of a Theological Seminary. This reached its consummation in the founding of the Seminary at Gettysburg in 1826. The establishment of Pennsylvania College followed in 1832. At the union of Marshall College with Franklin College in 1849, the interest of the Lutherans in the latter naturally ceased. An amicable adjustment of the finances was reached by transferring to the Trustees of Pennsylvania College about \$13,000 as an endowment of the Franklin Professorship.—EDITOR.

In approaching this historical sketch of the founding of Franklin College I do not wish to recall the fabled German professor who began his account of the Protestant Reformation with the creation of the world, or even the very modern instance of a certain statesman who found it necessary to base his argument for a

¹ An address delivered by Professor H. M. J. Klein, Ph.D., at the Charter Meeting of Franklin and Marshall College held on the College Campus at Lancaster, Pa., on Thursday, June 13, 1912.

Nicaraguan canal upon the Spanish conquest of America and of the pressing influence of the inquisition upon the native races of the Western Continent. Nevertheless a reference to our earliest American colleges is what first comes to my mind on this occasion.

Most of the nine colleges in America founded previous to the War of the Revolution were English in type and tradition. Harvard, which for fifty years remained the only college in America, was largely the product of Emanuel College, Cambridge. William and Mary, 1693, the second college in America, represented the Scotch tradition, its first president, James Blair, being under the influence of the University of Edinboro. Yale, the third college, had more of a native *American* influence, in as much as each of the men with one exception influential in founding Yale was a graduate of Harvard. Then followed Princeton, Columbia, the University of Pennsylvania, Brown, Dartmouth and Rutgers.

In the establishment of Rutgers College, 1766, we have the ideals of academic culture represented by the Hollanders. The University of Leyden and of Utrecht, two of the most famous universities of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were the inspiration of this school of the Hollanders which emerged at New Brunswick before the days of the American Revolution.

In fact it was the men who had graduated from these nine colleges of America that first fought out in public debate the vital issues of the revolution. There were not less than 2,500 graduates of these colonial colleges in America in 1775. A large proportion of them entered the active service of the army, but their chief merit lies in the fact that the revolution as a national movement was largely conducted by these men who had been liberally educated in the colonial colleges of America. Most of the leaders of that movement, with the exception of the Lees of Virginia, had been educated in this country. The author of the Declaration of Independence was a graduate of William and Mary. The Adamses came from Harvard. The great satirists of the Revolution were Trumbell of Yale, Freneau of Princeton and Francis Hopkinson of the University of Pennsylvania. Never was there a war in which college men had a larger influence in determining principles and results.

One who studies the history of America in post-Revolutionary

times is impressed with the fact that in every phase of human activity there was a rapid development of new life. There was the growth of a new national spirit. There was a marked impetus to the creation of new institutions. This was especially felt in the educational sphere. The founders of the republic felt that the continued existence, development and perpetuity of the new American commonwealth were dependent largely on the formation of an enlightened public community through the channels of education. Therefore the close of the Revolution marked the beginning of numerous institutions of higher learning. Individual States began to promote higher education within their boundaries, with marked enthusiasm and with an astonishing rapidity. Two years after the treaty of peace the assembly of the State of Georgia granted a charter to the university of that State. In 1784 was chartered the University of Maryland. A few days after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, the University of South Carolina was founded. Naturally the State of Pennsylvania was in the forefront of this new educational movement. In the Constitution of our Commonwealth adopted September 28, 1776, it had already been declared that all useful learning should be duly encouraged or promoted in the State through one or more universities.

One of the first public works which quickened the interest of the people of Pennsylvania at the close of the Revolutionary War was the establishment of a second college, the University of Pennsylvania having been the first, at some point west of the Susquehanna. Dickinson College was the result of this movement. Then followed the establishment of Franklin College, the third institution of higher education in the Commonwealth.

In the formation of Franklin College, the prime movers were impelled by at least four distinct motives. The first of these was the civic motive. The founders of the nation were deeply convinced that the kind of government they were about to establish in the formation of the American Constitution could be conserved only by the diffusion of knowledge, and that the prosperity and happiness of the several Commonwealths were dependent upon the right education of youth. They felt that liberty was made safe only by piety and learning. It is for this reason that the petition signed by twelve Philadelphians, who took the initiative in the founding of Franklin College, opens with the fol-

lowing preamble addressed to the Honorable, the Representatives of the free men of Pennsylvania in General Assmly Met: "Your petitioners have been led to undertake the charge of this institution from a conviction of the necessity of diffusing knowledge through every part of the State, in order to preserve our present republican system of government, as well as to promote those improvements in the arts and sciences which alone render nations respectable, great and happy."

The last phrase of the preamble just quoted brings out the second motive in the establishment of Franklin College, namely, the humanistic desire to enrich the country with minds that were liberally accomplished. This motive, too, is brought out in a strikingly interesting letter written by Dr. Benjamin Rush, of Philadelphia, to the first president of Franklin College and dated February, 1788, in which he says: "The present turbulent era is unfavorable to all peaceable enterprises. Nothing now fills the mind but subjects that agitate the passion. Let us not despair. As soon as our new government is established, the public spirit of our country will be forced to feed upon undertakings that have science and humanity for their objects."

Then there was the *religious* motive, coming, however, from an entirely different source. Ever since the early part of the eighteenth century large numbers of settlers of the Reformed and Luthran faith had migrated to Pennsylvania. Their ministers were men of learning, educated in German universities. But they were few in number. The two leaders of these denominations, Schlatter and Mühlenberg, had since the middle of the eighteenth century been writing appeals to Europe for help in behalf of the educational interests of the Reformed and Lutheran people of Pennsylvania. As a result a number of charity schools were organized in various parts of this State. But it was soon found that these were not adequate to meet all the educational and religious requirements of the day. A native ministry had to be educated, if the churches were to maintain themselves. In this connection the minutes of the Reformed Cœtus are interesting and valuable documents. In a cœtal letter of May 1784, Blumer, the stated clerk, wrote to the Synod of Holland: "Since indeed, sad experience has taught us that among those who offer themselves to be sent to Pennsylvania, many a one fails, it is the opinion of the most members of cœtus that it would be most sal-

utary for the Church if young men could be prepared and qualified for the ministry here in this land. However, to institute a school in which the salaries of at least three professors would have to be paid is at present beyond our power, if we are not assisted by generous and loving support from outside." The deputies in Holland at their meeting November 17 and 18, 1784, decided "that for weighty reasons they could not consent to the plan to erect an academy in Pennsylvania in order to prepare young men for the ministry in that country." Again, in April, 1785, Helfrich, the stated clerk writes: "We take the liberty to ask your opinion again about the establishment of a school right in the midst of the State of Pennsylvania in which young people may be prepared for the ministry. The motives which led us to such thoughts are as follows: First, because the reverent fathers in sending the ministers have not only great trouble but also great expense, although some ministers fail, either bringing a stain with them or cannot accustom themselves to the ways of this country. Second, many young people in this country who have great ability would like to devote themselves to the services of the Church, if they only had an opportunity, and many inhabitants have a greater confidence in natives than in foreigners just come in, because several times they have fared badly. Third, the English who are here are just establishing a school at Carlisle for which purpose they desired our assistance at our last Cœtus. Since we had reason to fear that this might suppress the German language and even our nation and might be to the disadvantage of our religion we excused ourselves."

The reason just assigned by the stated clerk for refusing to join in the establishment of Dickinson College brings us to the fourth motive that was in the minds of the founders of Franklin College. It was their intention to start here in Lancaster a school, the specific purpose of which was the education of the Germans of Pennsylvania who at that time constituted one-third of the inhabitants of the State.

The thirty years war followed by the French invasion of the Palatinate with all its consequent barbarity and misery had caused tens of thousands of German immigrants to hasten down the Rhine to Holland, then to be transported to England, after which they were finally brought to the American colonies. It was a migration that extended through the greater part of the

eighteenth century. Most of these exiles from home found their way into Pennsylvania. There were some good scholars among them who compared favorably with the best educated men of their time. They brought with them some excellent teachers, such as Boehm, Weisz, a graduate of the University of Heidelberg, Christopher Dock, the author of the first pedagogical work published in America, Stiefel, Hock, Leutbecker, all of them of German trait.

Benjamin Franklin was interested in the education of these German immigrants for reasons given this morning by the worthy President of the Board of Trustees. He was the first American on record who had visited a German university; having in 1776 attended a meeting of a royal society in Göttingen. It was probably through his influence that the trustees of the Philadelphia College as early as 1754 had appointed a professor of French and German languages, a fact that is noteworthy when one considers that Ticknor could not find even a German dictionary at Harvard as late as 1820.

When the Philadelphia College was developed into a university and received the new charter in 1779, a significant change was made in the constituency of the board of trustees of that institution, which led to a new epoch of German instruction at that institution. According to the new charter the six strongest denominations in Philadelphia were to be represented in a board of trustees at the University of Pennsylvania. It was in this way that two eminent German divines, John Christopher Kuntze, of the Lutheran Church, and Caspar Deitrick Weiberg, pastor of the Race Street Reformed Church of Philadelphia, became members of the board of trustees. Largely through the influence of these two German pastors the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania passed this resolution, January 10, 1780, viz.: "A German Professor of Philology should be appointed and his duty should be to teach the Latin and Greek languages through the medium of the German tongue, both in the academy and in the university." Kuntze was elected to fill the chair and served from 1780 to 1784. His successor was Heinrich Helmuth, a man who had served as pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church, Lancaster, and who at the time of his election to the chair of German philology was pastor of Zion's and St. Michael's Churches of Philadelphia.

Whether the department of German philology at the university was a success or a failure under Dr. Helmuth is an open question. Whether the German department of the university was transferred to Lancaster because of its growing demands or because of its temporary decline cannot, at this time, be fully determined. Dr. Larned, in his illuminating address on the subject delivered at the opening of the Beckstein Library, takes the position that the department was discontinued in Philadelphia in 1787 because of failure. He says the causes of decline seem to have been two: First of all, the constant and systematic efforts of the English to anglicize the Germans. This led to a corresponding fear on the part of the Germans that they would lose their German characteristics. Secondly, the preponderating influence of the English in the university and the secondary position to which the Germans were reduced. Hence the complaint of Weiberg: "Must they forever remain hewers of wood?" It is also worthy of note that the men who were active in the German department of the university were prominent in founding Franklin College. Weiberg and Helmuth are the connecting links. Dr. Larned concludes that it was a certain alienation of the Germans which led to this separation of the German and English forces of the State, and that it was thus that the seat of German academic education was transferred to Lancaster in the founding of Franklin College to meet the specific needs of the Germans. In this view Mr. J. J. Rosengarten concurs in his address made at the same occasion, the opening of the Beckstein Library. He says: "The experiment to teach German in the old College and later in the university was not successful but it led to the establishment of what is to-day Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster, which was to do for our Germans what the College of Philadelphia and the University of Pennsylvania had not been able to do."

Be that as it may, out of these several motives there came as early as December 11, 1786, an application signed exclusively by Philadelphians to the Legislature of Pennsylvania, praying for a charter of incorporation, for a German college and charity school to be established in Lancaster, stating also that there were prospects of considerable private contributions for carrying this design into effect and applying for a donation of a proportion of the lands that were appropriated by a former assembly for the

support of public schools. A general plan of the college to be established was sent with this petition. This plan stated that the petitioners had taken into consideration the necessity and advantage of diffusing literature among their German fellow citizens and had made choice of the borough of Lancaster for the establishment of a college because of the central and healthy situation of the place, the character of its inhabitants, the convenience with which students of every description might be accommodated with board and lodging and the probability that the necessary buildings might be secured at a moderate expense.

The plan further suggests that the design of the institution is to promote an accurate knowledge of the German and English languages, also of the learned languages, of mathematics, morals and natural philosophy, divinity and all such other branches of literature as will tend to make men good citizens. The institution was under the direction of forty trustees, fourteen of whom were to be from the Lutheran Church and fourteen from the Reformed Church, the remaining trustees to be chosen indiscriminately from any other society of Christians. The principals of the institution were to be chosen from the Reformed and Lutheran Churches alternately, unless such of the trustees as belonged to these societies should unanimously agree to choose some suitable person from any other society of Christians. From a profound respect for the character of His Excellency the President of the State, the institution was to be called Franklin College. This petition was signed first by Thomas McKean, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, a member of the assembly of 1762, a delegate to the Stamp Act Congress in 1765, Chief Justice of Pennsylvania from 1777 to 1799 and governor of the State from 1799 to 1808, a man who had received the degree of Doctor of Laws from Princeton, Dartmouth and the University of Pennsylvania. It was further signed by John C. Helmuth, a man who had received his training at Halle, who had come to America as a missionary to the Germans, had held prominent pastorates in the Lutheran Church and, as already noted, was the occupant of the chair of German philology in the University of Pennsylvania. Another signer was Caspar Weiberg, a prominent minister of the Reformed Church, a man who when the British held possession of Philadelphia preached to the Hessian mercenaries with such patriotic fervor that the British,

feeling the effects of his fearless appeals in the desertion of many of their Hessians, threatened his life and threw him into prison. The name of Peter Mühlenberg, the soldier preacher of the Revolution, is also appended to this petition. He was at that time vice-president of the executive council of Pennsylvania, a major-general in the American Army and later a noted United States senator. Following his name is that of Benjamin Rush, one of the most eminent men of the Revolution and of the generation following, a man who had graduated from Princeton, had studied medicine in London, Edinburgh and Paris, had been an incumbent in medical schools of the chairs of chemistry, and the theory and practice of medicine, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, a surgeon in the American Revolution, a writer and philanthropist of wide renown. We note also the names of William Rawle, a distinguished jurist, of Lewis Farmer, an officer of the American Revolution, and of several other men of distinction.

That the petitioners were justified in their statement that they had prospects of obtaining funds to carry their designs into effect is seen in the first subscription lists of Franklin College which is headed by His Excellency Benjamin Franklin, Esq., with a subscription of £200, followed by the names of Robert Morris, Peter Mühlenberg and a number of other eminent men.

In recognition of the petition referred to, the Legislature of Pennsylvania granted a charter to Franklin College on the 10th of March, 1787. The first section of this document reads as follows: "Whereas the citizens of this State of German birth or extraction have eminently contributed by their industry, economy and public virtues to raise the State to its present happiness and prosperity, and whereas a number of citizens of the above description in conjunction with others, from a desire to increase and perpetuate the blessings derived to them from the possession of property and a free government, have applied to this house for a charter of incorporation and a donation of lands for the purpose of establishing and endowing a college and a charity school in the borough of Lancaster, and whereas the preservation of the Christian religion and of our republican form of government in their purity depends under God in a great measure on the establishment and support of suitable places of education for the purpose of training up a succession of youth, who by being

enabled fully to understand the grounds of both may be led the more zealously to practice the one or the more strenuously to defend the other, therefore be it enacted and it is hereby enacted by the representatives of the free men of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met and by the authority of the same, that there shall be and hereby is enacted and established in the said borough of Lancaster and the county of Lancaster in this State a college and charity school for the instruction of youth in the German, English, Latin, Greek and other learned languages, in theology and the useful arts, sciences and literature, the title and constitution of which college shall be as is hereinafter set forth, that is to say, from a profound respect for the talents, virtues and services to mankind in general but more especially to this country of His Excellency Benjamin Franklin, Esq., President of the Supreme Executive Council, the said College shall be and hereby is denominated Franklin College."

Then follows a list of the first trustees of the college, a long line of influential men. Four of them, Rush, McKean, Clymer, and Morris, had been signers of the Declaration of Independence. A number of them, Mühlenberg, Mifflin, Daniel and Joseph Hiester, Chambers, Farmer, Crawford, and others, had been officers in the Revolutionary War. Mifflin, McKean and Joseph Heister became governors of Pennsylvania. Several of the trustees became senators of the United States, a number were prominent citizens of Lancaster, Casper, Schaffner, Jasper Yeates and others. There were names of Reformed, Lutheran and Moravian ministers; the Catholic priest of Lancaster was also on the list. These trustees were empowered by their charter to take themselves and their successors for the use of the College, "not more than the yearly value of £10,000, valuing one Portugal half Johannes weighing nine penny weight at three pounds."

The trustees were instructed in the charter to meet in the borough of Lancaster on the 5th day of June, to make and enact ordinances for the government of the college, to appoint the principal, vice-principal and professors to be known as the faculty of Franklin College, which faculty shall have the power of enforcing the rules and regulations adopted by the trustees for the government of the pupils by rewarding or censuring them, and by suspending such of them as after repeated admonitions shall con-

tinue disobedient and refractory (which sounds quite modern), and of granting degrees in the liberal arts and sciences to such pupils or other persons who by their proficiency or learning or other meritorious distinctions they shall think entitled to a degree. An interesting phase of this old charter was the explicit statement that the trustees were to be confined to the State and any member of the board who should remove from the State and settle elsewhere should be deemed to have resigned his office. It was further provided that in order to secure the beneficial effects which have been generally found to result from the zealous and industrious exertions of the clergy in the education of youth, whenever the seat of a clergyman shall become vacant, such vacancy shall be filled by the election of another clergyman in his place, so nevertheless that the aforesaid proportion of Lutheran and Reformed trustees shall invariably prevail.

The fifteenth section of the charter explains the charity-school feature of the early college. "To facilitate the acquisition of learning to all ranks of people being one of the primary and fundamental objects of this institution, one-sixth part of the capital, the real and personal fund of the college, not including the moneys paid for tuition, shall be irrevocably appropriated, together with such gifts and bequests as may be hereafter made to the college for that special purpose, to the maintenance and support of a charity school for children of both sexes, and all religious denominations on this most liberal plan consistent with the ability of said college." The charter also conferred 10,000 acres of land upon the trustees of Franklin College with the privilege of disposing of the same for the upbuilding of the institution.

According to the provision of the charter a meeting of the trustees was called in Lancaster, June 6, 1787. A printed circular was sent out by Pastors Helmuth and Weiberg announcing that the first German college in America was about to be founded. The circular opens by stating that agreeable prospects have been opened to the German nation in this western land, and God has especially blessed the Germans in Pennsylvania, that while numbers of them were poor and forsaken when they came to this country, their industry and the blessing of the Lord had placed many of them in prosperous circumstances. The circular further states that while the Germans have helped to make Pennsylvania the "Garden Spot of North America" they have not con-

sidered that a true republican must also possess education so as to take part in directing the rudder of the government and to give its children an opportunity of rising to the higher levels of republican utility. Now, continues the circular, the fortunate moment has arrived for the Germans, for in this first German college in America not only the Germans but many not Germans were deeply interested.

Extensive preparations were made for the formal opening and dedication of the new college. Invitations were sent broadcast. The Lutheran Ministerium and the Reformed Cœtus both met in Lancaster by special appointment during the week of the opening so that all the ministers could attend the exercises at dedication. Almost all the members of the board of trustees were present at the first meeting, a long line of carriages bringing many of them over sixty-six miles of road from Philadelphia. Representatives from the principal towns in Pennsylvania were at hand and as the late lamented Dr. Jos. H. Dubbs in his invaluable studies and researches in the early history of Franklin College has thoroughly established, Benjamin Franklin, then eighty-one years of age, left his activities as a member of the Constitutional Convention meeting in Philadelphia to be present at the dedication of the college to be named in his honor.

It must have been an imposing sight that met the gaze of the citizens of Lancaster on the morning of June 6, 1787. The procession marching from the courthouse to the German Lutheran Church headed by the sheriff and coroner of the county, followed by pupils and faculty and trustees of the college, and officers of the Reformed, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, Episcopalian and Moravian congregations of Lancaster, then by the members of the Reformed Synod and Lutheran Ministerium and finally by the officers of the militia.

At the dedicatory service hymns and odes in German and English were sung. The German address was delivered by Heinrich Mühlenberg, the first president of the college. A printed copy of this address is in our archives and furnishes intensely interesting reading. Its *theme* is the value of well-directed culture and is addressed particularly to the German parents and patrons of the institution. "My German brethren," he said, "you ought to thank God and next to God the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the erection of this institution in your midst

under the care of men whose ability and faithfulness you know. Fortunate is this city and the community. Your children shall not only be taught the fundamentals of religion and other necessary elements of knowledge but also the higher sciences. Doubly fortunate are the children of the poor to receive such an education without money and without price. Seize your opportunity. This college is for you Germans in America as yet the only one of its kind. Fellow citizens," he continued, "do not neglect it. To neglect it would be black ingratitude against God and against those who mean well to the Germans. Send your children; they will receive faithful instruction. Do not let them receive only the elements of knowledge, but give them the joy of going further and of learning also the higher sciences and the learned languages. Oh, Christian men, believers in Christ in this wilderness of the west, let your children study spiritual things, that they may sometime become useful witnesses of the teaching of our Lord in this community." Then he added: "We see assembled here the sum total of the teachers of German Christians in this land. So few among so many thousand. Help, ye men of Israel, that more laborers may be sent forth into this great harvest." Then he urged them not only to use the institution but also to help its advancement by counsel, intercession, good wishes and tangible deeds. "Strangers," he continues, "convinced of the necessity and the glorious consequences of a liberal culture, have already done much and will do more as soon as they see that you are in earnest. Strangers who do not speak our language, our English brethren, have done this to their praise, be it openly said. What German will now be able to close his heart and his hand to this enterprise, beautiful and noble as it is, for the advancement of God's glory and the furtherance of the German race? The city and county of Lancaster," he continues, "have up to this time had the name of doing much for public institutions. How much have they already done for strangers among whom their reputation for charitableness has been resounded far and wide. Fellow citizens, let not your reputation wane. The eyes of many eminent strangers and well-wishers and of all German teachers in this country are upon you to-day. Your children in generations to come will rise up and call you blessed." President Mühlenberg that day spoke with the voice of a prophet.

The English address was delivered by Dr. Joseph Hutchins, rector of St. James Episcopal Church of Lancaster, who had been chosen professor of English in the new institution. He was invited to make one of the opening addresses in order to show that the college was founded for the cultivation of the English language as well as for literary purposes. A remarkable feature is that this English address was not printed until twenty years after it was delivered. This was due probably to a certain common-sense frankness of expression on the part of Dr. Hutchins in regard to the study of English. Among other things he said: "Let this school be the vehicle of a more accurate and more general knowledge of the English language. Whatever impediments you throw in the course of spreading this language in its true pronunciation and elements among your children will be so many obstructions to their future interests in private and in public. As the limited capacity of man can very seldom attain excellence in more than one language, the study of English will consequently demand the principal attention of your children. I recommend this preference solely because it is the language of the United States, because it is the language of those laws and the courts of judicature by which your prosperity must be governed and their privileges secured. Upon the same principle of benevolence to the rising generation and of duty to the government that protected me I should be prompted if I lived in Germany to advise such Americans or Englishmen who had settled in that country to train up their children in a decided preference of the German language. Common sense pronounces it the duty of every parent to teach his children the prevailing language of the country in which they are likely to reside as citizens or subjects. On the score of religion we can have no reasonable objection to the use of the English tongue. Because it is undoubtedly as proper as the German for the conveyance of religious instruction of your children. The German may be studied as a secondary useful language but no English-American would wish to withhold it from that view, for we must allow a skill in languages to be frequently a useful and at all times an ornamental part of a liberal education." Then he makes an earnest plea for help for the education of the poor and needy and closes with a beautiful reference to Christ as the great teacher of teachers, whose religion leaves to men the right of private judgment, free

as the air you breathe, whose service is perfect freedom, in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life.

The dedicatory prayer was delivered by John Herbst, minister of the United Brethren² Congregation of Lancaster, the manuscript copy of which, in beautiful handwriting, is still in the archives of the college. A German Philadelphia newspaper, of Tuesday, June 19, 1787, gives a graphic account of the dedicatory exercises from the pen of one who was present on that occasion. He writes: "Yesterday it was my good fortune to be present at an event which for this part of Pennsylvania was entirely new, as well as of great consequence, namely, the founding and dedication of a college. On this occasion thousands of people from all the neighboring communities had assembled. The ceremonies made a great impression on the large gathering. The whole thing was carried on with such an order and magnificence that words fail me in describing it. One circumstance which must have impressed itself deeply on the heart of every conscientious man must be noted. It was a circumstance concerning which we may say that the like had not been seen heretofore in any land or among any people. On the same day, in the same church and in the same assembly of Christians, ministers of four different religions united one after the other in praising the most high Being. It is a prophecy of a coming kingdom of Christ. With the founding of this college a new epoch will begin in Pennsylvania. The introduction of the English language among our Germans who constitute at least one-third the inhabitants of this State cannot help but prove to be a blessing to themselves and to the Commonwealth. Their own language too will be preserved from decay and corruption, because in this college it is to be studied grammatically a circumstance which will enable them to bring all the discoveries of learned Europe to this country."

The first faculty of Franklin College was composed of men concerning whom Benjamin Rush said that a cluster of more learned or better qualified masters had not met in any university. Concerning its first president, Dr. Muhlenberg, and his work in natural history, we need say nothing after the exhaustive address delivered at the commencement this morning by our honored Dr. Schiedt. Suffice it to say that Dr. Schoepf, the eminent

German traveler, has recorded in his book on travels in the Confederation the fact that "if among Mühlenberg's countrymen there were many of his exemplary zeal after knowledge America would soon know better its own production and natural history would be greatly enriched." Dr. Wm. Hendel, the vice-president of the college, had been educated at Heidelberg, Germany, came to this country under the auspices of the Synod of Holland and was twice pastor of the Reformed Church of Lancaster. One of his contemporaries has written of him: "This man is one of the best preachers that I have been acquainted with in America. He possesses much science and knowledge, and without any sectarian or haughty spirit, he is in heart consecrated to the cause of true godliness." That was a great deal to say of any man in the eighteenth century. Dr. Harbaugh called him the St. John of the German Reformed Church. Frederick Valentine Melsheimer, educated at the University of Helmstadt, was the first professor of Greek, Latin and German in Franklin College. He was a voluminous writer and achieved distinction as a scientist, having frequently been called the father of American entomology, because of his collection in natural history which is now a part of the Agassiz museum of Harvard University, because of his work on the insects of Pennsylvania, the first publication of its kind in this country and because of his more pretentious work on the description of the insects of North America. William Reichenbach, professor of mathematics, trained in the schools of France, was an extensive writer on religious subjects. The Rev. Jos. Hutchins, the professor of English, was trained in the University of Philadelphia under Doctors Smith and Allison, and was considered a valuable man. It would indeed be an interesting study to trace the names of all the true and worthy men associated with Franklin College in its sixty-six years of independent existence. There was James Ross, great classical scholar, editor of a celebrated Latin grammar; there was Frederick Augustus Mühlenberg; there was Professor Brownlee, who was subsequently called to a professorship in Rutgers College, and Professor Schipper, who with Dr. Mühlenberg, published an English-German and German-English dictionary, the first of its kind printed in America.

In spite of all the splendid preparations, however, that were made for a German college in Pennsylvania, or rather for a col-

lege on behalf of the Germans, it cannot be said that Franklin College fulfilled the immediate expectations of its well-meaning founders. German influence in American education was not yet destined to be either consecutive or lasting. French influence seemed to be stronger in American education immediately after the Revolution than the German. The American Academy of Sciences and Arts in the United States was founded in consequence of French influence. The University of Virginia was founded by Thomas Jefferson according to French likeness, and it looked at one time as though Jefferson might transfer the whole faculty of Geneva to Virginia. While the French influence was to be largely supplanted by the German in the American educational institution of the nineteenth century, one feels that Franklin College was born almost too early to get the full benefit of all the impetus that ought to have come to it from the land of Schiller and Goethe, of Kant and Fichte and Schelling.

Yet Franklin College was not a failure. It was a prophecy. We have no apologies to make for the long, hard years of earnest struggle on the part of the friends and patrons of the institution. It fought its way through a period of deep darkness, almost of despair at times, but in 1849 after sixty-two years of existence, the board of trustees could with good conscience place on record the following resolutions: "this institution is worthy of the honorable name she has assumed and will retain it. Since the year 1787, under adverse circumstances, she has sustained a classical and mathematical school, without participating in the bounty of the State. It is true she received ten thousand acres as a donation in waste lands from the State, but for many years worthless and expensive to the corporation; nevertheless by careful conduct and an economical policy, she has accumulated a capital of \$40,000, whilst other sister institutions, although sectarian, and receiving the full bounty of the State, have failed."

This resolution was passed while negotiations were going on which resulted in the agreement that "one-third of the money belonging to Franklin College should be transferred to the trustees of Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg to endow with it the Franklin Professorship, the remaining two-thirds to be retained at Lancaster and given to the trustees of Marshall College, on condition of its removal to Lancaster, and its carrying on col-

legiate operations under the name of Franklin and Marshall College."

Another reason why Franklin College did not in its early days meet all the immediate expectations of its patrons is perhaps the fact that it was not really an outgrowth of German life. It stood, as has been well said, "not so much for what the German citizens of Pennsylvania were doing for themselves educationally as for what was being done in their behalf by others." It was a movement impelled from without rather than from within.

Yet in a very real sense Franklin College achieved its mission. The fourfold motive entering into its formation has never been lost in the 125 years of its existence. The civic, the humanistic, the religious motives, and the emphasis on German scholarship and thought and life has in a very decided measure characterized the history of this institution for 125 years. A century and a quarter is a long time for any American institution. There is not a written political constitution in the world to-day as old as that. A century and a quarter takes us back to the very springs of our national history and the very sources of our national character. The world has changed marvelously in that time. Empires and republics have come and gone. Dynasties have disappeared and new ones have risen into power. The whole educational system of the world has been revolutionized by German thought, life and scholarship. Our own fair city of Lancaster has been transformed from a small inland town of 900 houses to a large and prosperous city surrounded not by an unsubdued forest but by the garden of the world. Through all the years in which these changes have taken place this old college has under various forms maintained its organization and has held stoutly on its way through gladness and at times through gloom, through sunshine and at times through storm. It is a source of satisfaction to recall on this anniversary occasion that through all these years this third oldest college in Pennsylvania has entwined itself by many continuous threads with the history of this city and of this commonwealth. The growth of this old college has been like that of a venerable oak, with its spreading roots, its many branches, its constantly enlarging ramifications, its long years of usefulness to mankind. In its long life it has acquired the dignity of age without its decay. Though old in years, it still has the privilege of youth, the fair, far outlook of existence in

its prime. We who have gathered to rejoice on this anniversary occasion in the richness of our history, and the manifoldness of our work in the past, unite on this Charter Anniversary in the hope that this college, hallowed by associations (religious and civic) for a century and a quarter, may move down through the generations to come with an ever enlarged sphere of usefulness, with ever enlarged responsibilities, with ever increased resources for the accomplishment of its work—ever more full of gladness and growth and the grace of God.

The fathers had the honor to organize commonwealths, and to establish colleges. In the same unbroken spirit of loyalty to truth, justice and right, it is given to us, the sons, to maintain the commonwealths and colleges they founded. May the blessings of that God of Truth and Righteousness whom the fathers saw like one of old an unconsuming splendor in the wilderness be upon us as He was upon them, and fill us once more with the burning heart of youth, with a hope that is high, and a thought that is free, a life that is brave and deeds that are true, as we recall to-day our alma mater and

“The nobly living, nobly dead,
The glorious sons that she has bred.”

Lancaster, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

GOTTHILF HEINRICH ERNST MÜHLENBERG.

THE FIRST PRESIDENT OF FRANKLIN COLLEGE.¹

BY R. C. SCHIEDT.

NOTE.—This article is published by permission of the editor of *The Reformed Church Review*. Dr. Mühlenberg was a distinguished Lutheran, the son of the Patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America, and the pastor of Trinity Church at Lancaster from 1780 to 1815, the date of his death.—EDITOR.

Most of us assembled here this morning are of German stock, proud of our inheritance and ever ready to proclaim to the world our right and bounden duty to rejoice in everything German which makes for the betterment of the human race. It is therefore but natural that we should celebrate the 125th anniversary of an event in American history which marks an epoch in the German pioneer work of American civilization. We are proud of our Pilgrim Fathers who more than two centuries ago set foot on American soil. They were men of heroic mold, braving on fragile vessels the storms and dangers of a treacherous sea with no other inducement before them than the promise of freedom in an unknown wilderness. Their home land was in ruins, materially bankrupt and intellectually in bondage. The natural highways of commerce along the Rhine, the North and Baltic seas lay desolate, the once powerful cities of the Hausa Bund had degenerated into mere shadows of their former glory, citizenship had become petrified into a system of castes and privileges and their language had lost the dignity and purity it possessed in the thirteenth century and was broken up into numberless dialects void of strength, of nobility and of charm. But the spirit of the Fathers was still upon them. In this spirit they conquered the

1 An address delivered by Professor R. C. Schiedt, A.M., Ph.D., ScD., at the Charter Anniversary of Franklin and Marshall College held at the Fulton Opera House, in Lancaster, Pa., on Thursday, June 13, 1912. The main data of this paper are derived from Professor J. W. Harshberger's article on Mühlenberg in his book *The Botanists of Philadelphia and Their Work*, Philadelphia, 1899.

wilderness. In the nature of the case they could not vie in scholarship with their English fellow colonists, but the first essential of colonization is always a clearing in the thicket. In this they succeeded marvelously, preparing the way for the garden spot of the United States, and in the fulness of time they also came to their intellectual and spiritual heritage. That titanic power, that truly plastic spirit of the Reformation with its overflowing wealth of new creations and its promise of tremendous deeds could not be crushed. It was the very spirit which had fired the Pilgrim Fathers to cross the seas. It rejuvenated the language of the home land, filled it with a profound religious inwardness, an incomparable, sacred passion, gave it philosophical exactness, definiteness and the rare capacity for abstraction and endowed it with sensuous euphony, rhythm, harmony and objectivity. It was the same spirit which demolished the old isolated caste system and thereby enlarged German life. Everywhere organizations were formed in the home land for the improvement of speech and the alleviation of general distress. Facile princeps among the latter was August Herman Francke's orphan asylum with its famous schools and printing house in Halle now the Prussian university town. High ideals, iron discipline and a broad humanitarianism characterized the institution. The best minds of the nation were trained here, simplicity of faith, purity of heart and vigorous manly conduct were the guiding religious principles of its educational system, missionary propaganda was the aim as well as the method of work. Among the first young men of mark attracted to this new center of patriotic activity was one Heinrich Melchoir Mühlenberg, from Eimbeck in Hanover, who left the University of Göttingen in order to coöperate with Francke and study his singularly successful work. In 1742 he was sent to America to bring to the Germans across the sea the new enthusiasm and new intellectual and spiritual awakening of a rejuvenated Germany. He became the patriarch of the Lutheran Church in the United States, one of the largest religious bodies in the country, and the forerunner of a large number of very able ministers of the gospel. He sent his own three sons back to Halle to receive the splendid training for which Francke's institutions were justly famous, and to enjoy the advantages of the noted university. All three became distinguished American citizens. The eldest, the Rev. Johann Gabriel

Mühlenberg, was a major-general in the Revolutionary War, vice-president of Pennsylvania, a member of the House of Representatives of the United States, a United States senator and a well-known revenue officer. Another son, Frederick Augustus, also a minister of the gospel, was a member of the Continental Congress, a member and speaker of the Pennsylvania Legislature and a member of the House of Representatives.

The third son, Gotthilf Heinrich Ernst Mühlenberg, the object of our eulogy, became the first president of Franklin College and one of the most distinguished botanists of his time. The choice of the first president for Franklin College could not have been more auspicious. On the one hand strong pressure was brought to bear on the German population of Pennsylvania, numbering then at least one-third of the total number of its inhabitants, to establish a first-class institution of learning of their own type and after their own racial model, because it was felt not only by the best English but also by the best German element that the higher training of the mind was sadly neglected among the Pennsylvania Germans. On the other hand, there was a young man, born in the colonies and trained in the foremost German schools and universities of his time, who thoroughly understood the needs of his kin and was filled with the high ideals and broad humanitarianism of his day.

He easily stands out to-day as the most dominant figure in the early history of Franklin College; dominant by virtue of his *personality*, his *scholarship* and his *international reputation*. Personality is largely a matter of inheritance and environment. I have touched upon his inheritance; with your permission I shall enlarge upon his *environment*. The most impressionable years of his life, *i. e.*, from the tenth to his eighteenth year, were spent in Germany, in the environment of Francke's institutions and the University of Halle, in the immediate neighborhood of Wittenberg and Weimar, where the new life of a new nation was writhing in its birth throes. He came there in 1763 when Frederick the Great had reached the zenith of his power, had vanquished his foes and secured for the German name its rightful recognition. However, it was not military glory only which illumined the German, more particularly the Prussian name; Frederick the Great was not only a great general but also a scholar, a lover of the beautiful, a writer and a musician. He

embodied the aspirations of the age and the age was surcharged with the fulminating forces of a new idealism. Young Mühlenberg not merely learned here the rudiments of Latin and Greek and Hebrew, of mathematics and natural history. He could have learned that just as well in New England, whose teachers were the peers of the brightest lights of Oxford's classic scholarship.

Nay, he acquired something more important and different, something especially needed here in Pennsylvania, something which the sagacious Franklin had clearly recognized as essential for the proper development of the Pennsylvania Germans, when he urged that the Germans who had so tenaciously clung to their language should learn to write it and speak it in the best form and to catch the spirit of that new Germany which had experienced such a wonderful rejuvenescence since the middle of the eighteenth century; for a language is only the symbol of the ideas which fill and move and agitate a people or an age. It was a wise suggestion on the part of one of the wisest of the age. He had witnessed the new German awakening at the University of Göttingen and even planned to make the University of Pennsylvania an American Göttingen. And what was this specific something expressed by the new German tongue? Out of the dissolutions and desolations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the German spirit had soared on high, as it were, to find entrance and take refuge in the realm of the beautiful. Religion, as a mere abstract devotion to transcendental speculations, had ceased to be the determining power of the age in Germany, nor was it *politics* as the realization of the *idea* in the *sphere* of concrete, historical conditions. Instead of the expected free religion after the principle of protestantism and instead of the dreamed-of free state which belonged to the future, we find art, liberal art to be the watchword and problem of the times. Frederick Schlegel had epigrammatically expressed the mission of his people in these words, "Do not squander your faith and your love in the political world, but in the divine world of knowledge and culture sacrifice your innermost life, in the sacred lava stream of eternal culture." Or as Mühlenberg expresses it in simpler language in his inaugural address, "If you wish well to your country, if you wish to make your children acceptable before God and men, if you wish the eternal gratitude of your descendants to fulfill the greatest of your obligations, educate your children.

Lands and houses and all earthly goods will perish, but a good education will remain; it is the best inheritance, for it lasts till eternity."

The German nation then began its *classic aesthetic career*. Art absorbed the attention and the strength of all minds and fermented in all hearts. All at once there appeared a host of poets following the footsteps of the great teachers and models of the beautiful, the Greeks. Lessing was the first to express this new quality of his race and to make them conscious of it; he was the first one who discovered the idea of the beautiful, the essence of art and he demonstrated that the return to the simplicity of nature alone would lead to a full appreciation of art; not the nature of Rousseau, but glorified nature, nature borne of the spirit, the nature of the Greeks, the nature of a Shakespeare, is the mother of all art. Lessing's *Laokoon* and *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* were revelations in those days, revelations of the incarnate consciousness of the age. And as Lessing awakened the aesthetic consciousness of his nation, Goethe emphasized the efficiency, the living reality of the beautiful and Schiller enlarged the merely subjective enjoyment and applied it to history and politics. The *aesthetic consciousness* became the *aesthetic deed*, the mere *concept* of the beautiful became incarnate in a *beautiful personality*, as represented in Goethe and Schiller themselves. Schiller went even further. The beautiful was to him "an education of the human race for freedom and morality," and his immortal poems became prophecies which pointed the way which the mass of people later on had to travel, the way from the merely aesthetic to the political consciousness. "Wir wollen sein ein enig Volk von Brüdern" leaped from the stage into life and found its marvellous fulfilment.

But while Schiller in a literary and poetic way expressed the highest principle in education, Kant and Wilhelm von Humboldt gave it precision and philosophical depth. Luther's language had reached the stage of full fruition, the philosophical principle dominated. It great wealth of detail in the scale of meaning permits the expression of the most minute differences even for the mere indications of shades of meaning which cannot be analyzed. While Hume exhausted the English vocabulary in destructive criticism, Immanuel Kant succeeded by means of the *German language* to build up a thought structure which the most

skillful translator cannot make intelligible in a *foreign* tongue to the common man. No one can successfully translate the word "Weltanschauung" with all the wealth of its meaning and the possession of a "Weltanschauung," a standard of judgment for all situations in life, is after all the end and aim of the best educational systems.

I have thus only indicated what it meant for the young college at Lancaster to have as its head a man who came directly from the wonderful environment which had in it the nascent forces of the great educational ideals of later times. When Franklin College was opened in 1787 Schiller gave to his nation the immortal *Don Carlos* and Goethe his *Iphigenie*, while Kant published his *Critique of Practical Reason*. Goethe had passed from the pessimism of *Werther* to the optimistic humanitarianism of *Iphigenie* and Schiller from the naturalism of the satyrist to the idealism of the artist, while Kant, in granting practical reason the primacy over pure reason, proclaimed that the demands of the will and of action are above knowledge and speculation. Here we have the fundamental educational ideas prevalent in Germany at the end of the eighteenth century. Personality as the object of education had been the guiding principle of Francke's institutions from the beginning, and the history of the first Mühlenbergs is the test for its correctness.

What the first president as *scholar* and *educator* was to Franklin College can hardly be estimated by the poverty-stricken conditions of the young institution or by the curriculum of the first years. All such beginnings are obscure and frequently desperately discouraging in the beginning; even Harvard and Yale had such experiences. It was considerably more so in a community and among a race which to a large degree was opposed to a higher education as were the majority of those early Mennonites and Palatines. The essential factors in the movement were after all the *men* who had charge of it, the remarkable faculty and equally remarkable Board of Trustees, and the ideals which guided them. Of them we read in a letter from Philadelphia in 1787: "The enthusiasm and generosity with which they go about furthering every object having reference to their nation and their religion cause it to be hoped that this college will within a few years be inferior to none of the oldest colleges in America, in wealth and public regard." To appreciate Mühlenberg as a

scholar and educator we must know him not primarily as a theologian or linguist but as a scientist or more especially a *botanist*.

The beginning of Franklin College is coincident with the dawn of modern science. Both owe much to the spirit of the Reformation. The spirit of freedom of individual research born of the freedom from ecclesiastical authority in matters intellectual stimulated the best minds to restudy old values and open up unknown spheres of truth. In rapid succession the elements which constitute our immediate environment were isolated and described, air and water and common salt lost their mysterious character and Priestly and Scheele and Lavoisier and Cavendish laid the foundations of modern chemistry. In physical science our own Benjamin Franklin towered high above his contemporaries. Robert Fulton, born in Little Britain, Lancaster County, started on his career of steamboat construction. In the biological world, Linnæus, of Sweden, ruled supreme. He had published his immortal *Systema Naturae* and it introduced the binominal nomenclature into the methods of classification. Naturally at the time when the authority of a person in matters of faith had been replaced by the authority of a book, the key to all knowledge of nature was found in the words of Holy Writ, "Have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of air and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." "And Adam gave names to all cattle and to the fowl of the air and to every beast of the field." The chief mission of the biologist of those days was to discover and describe as many animals and plants as possible; it was the day of the making of catalogues in local floras and faunas. Prominent in this line were two professors in the New Franklin College. Henry Mühlenberg, sometimes called the Linnæus of America, and Friederich Valentine Melsheimer, universally acknowledged as the father of American entomology, whose insect collection formed the nucleus of the Harvard collections in entomology, both had received their education in German schools and universities, one in Halle and the other in Helmstädt; both constantly coöperated and corresponded with European scientists.

A certain Doctor Johann David Schoepf, a Hessian stationed in New York during the Revolutionary War, travelled through the eastern States to Florida in search of medicinal plants. He afterwards published his experiences and only lately this book

was republished in an English translation. From it we learn that he became well acquainted with Mühlenberg, whom he praises for his accurate knowledge of the plants and minerals of America. The correspondence of the two soon led Mühlenberg into correspondence with other eminent botanists in Germany, England, France and Sweden, with such men as Hedwig, Hoffman, Persoon, Pursh, Smith, Schreber, Sturm, Willdenow, William Aiton, Batsch, Beauvais, Schrader, of Göttingen, Kurt Sprengel, of Halle, and Olaf Schwartz, one of Linnaeus' most eminent pupils. From this correspondence we gather that Mühlenberg was not merely a cataloguer of plants but a master of scientific botany as it was then known. He was one of the first botanists to recognize the necessity of establishing a natural system of classification as over against the artificial system of Linnaeus. Gärtner, of Tübingen, Baatsch, of Jena, and Sprengel, of Halle, had aroused considerable interest in the study of natural affinities of plants as revealed in fruit and seed. DeCandolle in Geneva and Robert Brown in England completed their work and elaborated the natural system and its fundamental principles and laws of classification with a clearness and depth such as no one before them had displayed. They laid the foundations on which later Darwin built. With most of these men Mühlenberg corresponded, discussing the relation of plants as well as their economic value. In July, 1785, he presented to the American Philosophical Society founded by Franklin, an outline for a *Flora Lancastriensis* and at the same time a manuscript calendar of flowers. In February, 1791, he communicated his index *Florae Lancastriensis*, still arranged according to the artificial system of Linnaeus and containing 454 genera with nearly 1,100 species, including both wild and cultivated plants. A supplement of this index which appeared in the *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* in September, 1796, contained 44 additional genera with 62 species of phanerogams, of which 9 were unknown species of grasses while the cryptogams were represented by 226 additional species, belonging to 29 genera.

In 1809 he decided to write a catalogue of the known native and naturalized plants of North America, which naturally implied that he was assisted in his researches by men all over the country. He also made at the same time a complete description of the plants growing around Lancaster and likewise a complete

description of all other North American plants which he had himself seen and arranged in his herbarium. A part of these works dealing with the grasses was published in 1817, two years after his death. The manuscript of it was presented by Zacharias Collins to the American Philosophical Society in 1831 while his valuable herbarium was bought for \$500 by a friend and presented to the American Philosophical Society.

Mühlenberg, however, was far in advance of Linnaeus in regard to the true mission of a botanist. Linnaeus distinctly declared that the highest and only worthy task of a botanist was to know all species of the vegetable kingdom by name. He was not an investigator of nature in the modern sense of the word, he never made a single important discovery throwing light on the nature of the vegetable world.

True investigation of nature consists not only of deducing rules from exact and comparative observation of the phenomena of nature, but in discovering the genetic forces from which the causal connection, cause and effect may be derived. In the pursuit of these objects it is compelled to be constantly correcting existing conceptions and theories, producing new conceptions and new theories and thus adjusting our own ideas more and more to the nature of things.

Science according to the scholastic or Aristotelian method is playing with abstract conceptions. The best player is he who can so combine them together that the real contradictions are skillfully concealed; facts are thus merely examples for the illustrations of fixed abstract conceptions, but in the real investigation of nature they are the fruitful soil from which new conceptions, new combinations of thought, new theories and general views spring and grow. Linnaeus was a true Aristotelian, not only where he is busy as a systematist and describer but where he wishes to gain information on the nature of plants and on the phenomena of their life in his *Fundamenta*, his *Philosophica Botanica* and in his *Amoenitates Academicæ*.

Mühlenberg was of a different mould. In a letter dated November 8, 1791, he wrote: "I am collecting as far as I can all I can learn concerning the medicinal and economic uses of our plants and am writing it down. If the medicinal application seems to be confirmed from different sides, and agrees with the character of the plant, I either try it on myself or commend it to

my friends. I raise most of the grasses in my garden and experiment how often they can be cut and whether they are readily eaten by horses or cattle. He was pre-eminently an experimenter, and his correspondence with Professor Hedwig, of Leipzig, the greatest authority on thallophytes and mosses, and one of the first plant histologists and practiced microscopist shows that his interest lay far beyond mere classification. His exalted position among scientists of his age is shown by the honors bestowed upon him. The University of Pennsylvania conferred on him the degree of Master of Arts in 1780, and Princeton that of Doctor of Divinity in 1787. He was made a member of the American Philosophical Society on January 22, 1785. He received diplomas and awards from the Imperial Academy of Erlangen in 1791; the Society of Friends of Natural History, Berlin, 1798; the Westphalian Natural History Society, 1798; the Phytographic Society of Göttingen, 1802; the Academy of Natural Science of Philadelphia, 1804; the Society for the Promotion of the Useful Arts, Albany, N. Y., 1805; the Physiographic Society of Lund, Sweden, 1824 and the New York Historical Society, not quite six weeks before his death in Lancaster, May 13, 1824.

Mühlenberg was also a very genial host. He entertained largely in his home in Lancaster. Alexander von Humboldt and Aime Bonpland sought him there on their return from their long journey from Spanish America.

A true educator must necessarily be a man of broadest culture, appreciative of all that is beautiful and inspiring in human life and at times a jolly good fellow. Mühlenberg was all of this, his home was the center of Lancaster's social and literary activity and exerted through him its most potent influence upon the community. But the chasm between the leaders and the constituency of the new college was too wide and progress exceedingly slow, and when the Corsican crushed the spirit of the home country on the battlefield of Jena, Franklin College felt the blow most severely. It was only after the rejuvenating baptism of the German nation in the blood of Leipzig's battlefield and the awakening of young Germany during the heroic days of the Burschenschaft movement and the storms of 1848 that the spirit of Mühlenberg came to life again in the personality of Frederick Augustus Rauch, the first president of Marshall College. And when

well nigh three-fourths of a century after the opening of Franklin College Germany had become a united nation and the glory of the new empire shed its light across the seas and the continents of the globe, the Rip Van Winkle woke up in Pennsylvania, and the Pennsylvania German Society was organized—and what is more gratifying, organized by an alumnus of old Franklin College. The deeds of the new Germany threw a halo around the deeds of the old, the fame of the new made the reputation of the old secure. What the men of old Franklin College had prayed, loved and died for has begun to be realized in these latter days; the Pennsylvania German has become a mighty force in the public life of the nation, in agriculture, in industry, in commerce and in the professions the Pennsylvania German plays a noble part. Old Franklin College has fulfilled her mission.

One hundred and twenty-five years after Mühlenberg's first publication of the *Flora Lancastriensis* a son of Franklin and Marshall and of German ancestry, Dr. John K. Small, has again published *Flora Lancastriensis* as a jubilee gift to his alma mater. The spirit of the old lives in the new, but the new has embodied in it a century of scientific progress, of scholarship and accuracy, born and bred in Germany and transmitted to the nations of the earth as the most precious gift of the Teuton spirit. May the force of personality, the breadth and accuracy of scholarship and the deserved reputation of Gotthilf Heinrich Mühlenberg ever abide as a most precious heritage and an aspiring stimulus with all the sons of old Franklin and Marshall!

Lancaster, Pa.

ARTICLE VI.

METAPOLITICS AND SOCIAL REFORM.

BY PROFESSOR W. H. WYNN, D.D.

"Absolute individuality is an absurdity," says Amiel, and we cannot take exception to the truth of the remark. But we must still insist, that there is no sound political order that does not have individualism as its permanent base. That a man should stand alone and self-contained; independent; a human atom; apart from all relationships, through which he is to share the common social life of the whole—this is inconceivable, and, of course, there is no such idea in the minds of those who hold that individualism is the essential life-giving principle of all those forms of government, in which the rights of the people are to be conserved.

Democracy is the rule of the people—it will not be pedantry to recall the etymology of that famous term—two Greek words, "demos," the people, and "kratein," to rule. It has been the watchword of political philosophy, since the days the Aryan populations planted their civilizations on European soil. By this time, one would think, its essential meaning must have made itself known, so that scheming sophists would find no ambiguity of import on which to exercise the ingenuity of their craft. But recent events have made it painfully plain, that the term may easily become a shallow shibboleth on the tongue of the demagogue, by artfully defining the people to be everybody thrown together in a mass.

The fallacy lies in making the people the antithesis of the individual, instead of its complement—as if, when thinking of the mass, we should insist on crushing out all idea of the unit of the mass, in order to give our darling theory the right of way. Consciously or unconsciously, all forms of theoretic "collectivism" are doing this very thing—training to count "ten," without beginning at the figure "one."

Let us by all means keep reason at the helm. The people are but an aggregate of the individuals that make up its mass; and we may be sure that there is nothing in the mass but what was

pre-existent, in diversified measure and quality, in the units that make up the mass. The sanguine reformer is evermore prone to imagine a surplussage of magic in the people as a whole, of which he finds no counterpart in the single man whom he meets on the street. The people, in their aggregate capacity, are somehow thought to be infallible; will make no mistake when pronouncing and acting for the public weal—right there, in the midst of a condition of society, in which a large number of individual citizens are charged with being scoundrels and thieves.

"Hardly this"—some one plucks us by the sleeve. The people that are to be trusted are the good people and not the bad; for, do you not see, our aim is to arouse the good people to avail themselves of whatever lawful means may be at their command, to cast the bad out? But to define the people as the "good people" would involve a tangle in political philosophy and ethics, that could never be united. A standard would be required, and there is no civic function invested with sufficient authority to set that up.

Besides, in popular government, the only place where these good and bad elements could measure arms, would be at the polls—what if, in the contest there, the bad element should get the upper hand? The people that rule are those that go to the polls, where no discrimination is made, further than as to the qualifications for suffrage which the law prescribes. The character, or social standing, of the elector, is in no way entitled to a privileged consideration at the polls. The badge of citizenship, in all forms of democratic government, is the ballot, and the only authorized definition of the people, politically considered, which the reformer can honestly put forth, is, that it consists of all those who are entitled to go to the polls.

Then what? Why, the people, as we figure them at the polls—these people who are the acknowledged sovereigns in a great republic, and who can always be trusted, we are told, to order that which is right and best—these people at the polls, are always a majority *and* a minority, with regard to any proposed measure looking to the public weal. A democracy without the ballot is inconceivable—the ballot, through which the people exercise their right to rule, by making their will known. Therefore, except on the impossible hypothesis of complete homogeneity of sentiment, this prerogative of the ballot will always necessitate a

government by party management—say what we will, it cannot otherwise go on. The ballot and party are bound together in the machinery of all popular government, as inseparably as the steam and piston-rod in an engine that is under way.

When, therefore, we announce it as the fundamental maxim of our political organization, that the people must rule, and can get the formula away from the partizan persiflage in which it is habitually intoned, we find it altogether equivalent to saying "the majority rules." Of course, the majority is not infallible, for the individuals that make it up are distinguished from their rivals at the polls, only in numbers, and not at all as to the final accuracy of their judgment with reference to measures which are yet to be tried. What remains to be done—and herein the high function of constitutional government comes out in relief—is, to protect the minority against the possible tyranny of the majority, in case of some party triumphant, that would threaten the liberties of the people as a whole. Our fundamental law, and our higher courts, are our anchor here, sure and steadfast, cast within the veil.

But we must be careful not to put on the shoulders of the majority a burden of responsibility heavier than they can bear. The problems of government are greatly diversified and often much complicated in the issues they involve. Who are these who go to the polls—to what extent could their average intelligence and integrity be trusted, to render a final verdict on matters about which, in the nature of the case, they could not be adequately informed? Not for a moment would they themselves assume as much—being busy in their several vocations in life, they have neither the time nor the training for so responsible a task. Indeed, we run no risk in saying, that it is not for that purpose they go to the polls. They are not jugglers; there is no magic in the ballot; it is only the political prestidigitator that will put it forth as an instrument of that kind.

Let us, once for all, have it clearly in mind, that the people go to the polls, by way of giving expression to public opinion, that is, to say what the sentiment of the majority of the voters is, in any given juncture of affairs—therefore to give utterance to the will of the people in an indeterminate way. And so it comes to pass, that their suffrage is almost exclusively exercised in selecting men—capable men—men of recognized ability and training.

who will formulate that will in authorized statutory phrase, and put it into operation as a decree of the State.

But this is representative government, a government by the people through public servants, carefully chosen, to formulate and execute their sovereign will. Herein we discover the strongest bulwark for freedom, that the long and turbulent experience of the ages has succeeded in setting up. It is just in this particular, that our modern democracy is immeasurably in advance of that of ancient Greece, for example, where, for lack of this principle, the instability and mobocracy of the Popular Assembly could never be overcome.

We hear much now-a-days of the scheming of bosses, and the tricking of machinery, in the corrupt management of party politics—and it is bad enough we are ready to believe. But it will save us from the blind blunder of attaching the responsibility for all this, to the skirts of our constitutional form of government, thought, by this time, to have become worn and shredded to a condition of beggarly rags flapping in the wind—to open Greek history, for example, and read there of an experiment in “pure democracy,” or the “direct rule of the people,” by a nation whose capacity for civic achievement and constructive legislation has never been surpassed.

The story is stimulating and instructive to the last degree. We should learn what it meant among them, that, in certain great crises in their affairs, there should have been occasion for the kindly usurpation of power in the hands of some “*turannos*,” or “*demagogos*”—an able, and, possibly, a patriotic citizen, ruling in his own name, but the creature of an emergency, whose mission it was to protect the people against themselves.

Now what has all this to do with the frenzied metapolitics of our day?—*metapolitics*, a term used by the great German minister, Stein, as descriptive of all those “airy and unpractical schemes of reform,” with which our political heavens, in times of economical depression, usually abound?

Well, the cry of progress is in the air. Progress! Progress! Let us move on; we are in a rut; the old order changeth; the heavy weight of tradition and custom is crushing us down; come let us throw it all overboard, and put our combined shoulders to something new! To which we make answer, that something new, in the onward advance of human affairs, is indeed always

due. The old must be sloughed off to make way for the new—progress cannot otherwise go on. But the onus of responsibility presses hard upon the manner in which the reformer will address himself to the task, and the political theory he will entertain.

Every man must have at least two oars to his little shallop, one for the past, and one for the future—if he would be safe and wise in navigating the stream of time. Just as the right paddle dips into the wave in advance, while the left is pushing against the current in the rear, and, in this way, a continuity of motion is kept up—so in progress, in every line of pursuit, the past and the future must keep time with each other in rhythmic beat. The mistake we are likely to make, is, that the old and the new are discontinuous in kind. The one will be regarded as husk, and the other as fruit—a misleading analogy, and, in politics and religion, the prolific mother of a spawn of theoretical chimera, over which the car of progress can, with difficulty, make its way.

All forms of political fanaticism are engendered in this nest. Thus, for example, we may hear it every day on our streets, and, not unfrequently, from sources higher up, that our government is a failure; broken down; worn out; clean collapsed; the mere tool of the money power; the steeds in the chariot of progress fallen dead in their tracks. If you take advantage of a lull in this denunciatory bluster, long enough to call for an unimpassioned statement, as to how this state of things has come about, the answer will be "individualism"—a cant phrase with all those who prophesy in this tone—"individualism," on which our democratic institutions were unfortunately built up, and on which they have finally foundered—this is the source of all our ills, and it is this that we must proceed to tear up root and branch.

But, of course, our interlocutor would not have us understand, that a negative remedy was all that would avail. Individualism gone, he would have something to put in its place; something radically different; a sort of paternalism, or collectivism, in which the body politic would be made to rest on the mass instead of the individual, and, behold, all our wrongs would be righted, and our social inequalities would be thrown to the winds. Sweet dream!—but the obstacles in the way of it are heaven-high and hell-deep.

Let us imagine some flaming, vociferous, political Adullamite setting about this stupendous business, under the banner of

progress, what must be his preliminary step? Well, as undertaker, he must lay out and bury the dead government with due decorum, we would fain believe, to the illustrious corpse. But that corpse was none other than the Constitution of 1787—by supposition lifeless, now, in place of which our new time political prophet is to give us “pure democracy,” which is to be a living thing, originated *de novo*, as over against a form of government that was dead, dead, and already far gone on the way of decay. Consider for a moment what all this means! That Constitution organized a “representative democracy,” and with this, we are bound to say, a “pure democracy” can have no affinity whatever; has not the same footing; is not planted in the same soil; does not breathe the same air.

O, well, to remove this obstacle, and justify the prospect, we are repeatedly reminded, that all this will come about by no private initiative of ours, but in the due process of cosmic “evolution.” Evolution! evolution!—it is a crime to be ignorant of what evolution is doing, of the wondrous transformations it is working on the civilizations of our day. Yes, but it would take the genius of Huxley and Herbert Spencer, with the added erudition and ingenuity of Karl Marx, to show us how “pure democracy” grew up out of “representative democracy” as its political root. It cannot be done. The thing is inherently and flagrantly absurd. Our new-time reformers cannot foist a fallacy of that kind on the educated mind of our thinking age. Their logical alternative is, “revolution”—to overthrow the Constitution, and put their crude and untried formulas in its stead. Because their theory of government antagonizes the theory of government on which the Constitution was framed, and it is forever settled that a free state cannot have a bipartite head.

We must never let go the idea, that the individual is the living unit of the abstract mass, and that, therefore, to use the strong language of our incoming President, Dr. Wilson, “*the whole basis of government is individual responsibility*”—to locate it elsewhere, would be to carry our Constitution down to Tophet, and amid the wild shouts of the irresponsible mob, throw it in. And then it is a clear case; no right-minded man will call it in question—the mass can never be set over, antithetically, against the individual, except upon the impossible hypothesis, that the mass shall be homogeneous in sentiment, and move on, in un-

broken harmony, under the sway of one purpose, and toward one indefeasible end. A hundred men are heaving at a lever—they are a unitary power so long as they simultaneously obey the word of command. But if fifty of them refuse, what then?

We write feelingly on this subject, because the recent unkindly assault on the Constitution is fresh in our minds, and the wound is not the less painful, now that the crisis is past. That dear old Constitution of ours! we are historically so deeply indebted to it; it has shone so gloriously in the folds of our flag, in peace and in war, on land and sea, all round the world, that we cannot stand by and see an irreverent hand laid on it, without immediately and indignantly resenting the blow.

But, it may be said, the arraignment is too severe. With an air of sincerity, these new-time reformers will often be heard protesting, that their innovations do not contemplate a raid on the Constitution, or on the system of representative government which the Constitution prescribes. They would simply relieve the people by "putting their representative government directly in their own hands." Our trouble is to attach any sensible meaning to such an aggregation of words; to conceive of ideas so hostile harboring amicably under the same roof. As well propose to save and serve the Constitution by abolishing its methods and cutting out its heart—for that is all that the mystifying phraseology can possibly mean.

Pure democracy, or the direct rule of the people, is conceivable, only, when representative government has disappeared from the stage. Even then, we make bold to say, it is forever and ever unrealizable in act. History will bear us out in this—there is no such thing as the direct rule of the people—every attempt in that direction has broken up in a mob. The people go to the polls; suffrage is their scepter; two things they can do at the polls, and only two—first, give expression to the indeterminate will of the majority of the legalized voters; and, secondly, choose the men, who, in their legislative and administrative functions, will formulate that will, and put it into effect. This is representative rule, and it can have no fellowship whatever with any of the innumerable schemes and dreams of socialism, which are now so noisily clamoring to be heard.

A more serious aspect of our subject we must not overlook. In developing and utilizing the immense material resources of

our country, it has come to pass, that the larger bulk of its available wealth and property has fallen into the hands of a few, who get thereby an undue and dangerous preponderance in the social life of our times. About one hundred powerful business men, it is said—money magnates, plutocrats, corporation kings—have our helpless government in their greedy grip, and can coerce our legislatures and corrupt our courts, by shutting up their vaults, and otherwise paralyzing trade, until their selfish ends are successfully attained. They are our tyrants, and have the vast army of the proletariat under their heel—an oligarchy that feeds and fattens on the blood and bread of the poor.

Against all this, it is said, our form of government is powerless to react. Our boasted principle of representative officialism is easily turned into a system of political bossism which answers all outcry for industrial and social justice with a jeer and a sneer. A system thus perverted, and yielding itself so easily to be turned against itself, stands self-convicted of inherent inefficiency, and the thing to be done, is to rush in upon it and crush it out. But in all movements looking to reform, blind violence can never avail. Being an economic evil, some remedy must be found, that will keep well within the realm of economic interest, where the disease exists.

To the socialist, the diagnosis is easy and direct. He goes to the root of the evil, he thinks, by denying the right of private property, and, so, taking out of the body politic the vicious system of competition, and the innumerable ills that follow in its train. For him there is just dawning a new age, at the heart of which is this strange economic vagary, that he prophesies will be an unfailing panacea for all our social ills—all property will fall into the hands of the State. But considering the magnitude of the business interests of this country, it is little short of madness to propose their transfer and reinvestment in what is relatively an ideal and impersonal concern—a proprietorship that had no part in producing the goods. It would be like giving over our planet to other management than the unwearied Vulcans, who toil incessantly in the smithies of the sun.

Moreover a denial of the right of private property carries with it, by virtue of an inherent logical necessity, a denial of the individuality of man, of his inalienable conviction, that he is, in some way, the owner of himself. If a man owns himself, indefeasibly,

out and out, by an eternal tenure in the order of things—why—that fact itself entitles him to go on getting and owning anything and everything else, with the single inhibition that, in his acquiring and using, he may not trespass on the rights of other men, or forget his independence on Almighty God. In other words he may gratify his instinct of ownership, subject only to the operation of moral checks.

But in concluding thus, we leave all social systems immeasurably in the rear. Their sweep of vision never transcends the limited horizon of the economic world. Everything moral assumes for basis a feeling of individual responsibility; arising from the conscious endowment and exercise of an inalienable free will; and there is no consistent theory of socialism that will indulge for a moment the old-time tenet of an unconstrained, self-adjusting, free will. The great leaders in all these schools of collectivism repudiate free will, as, indeed they must, in order to get individualism out of the way. According to them, the world is tossing on a wild sea of social confusion, because of conflicting economic interests, the struggle between labor and capital, the unequal distribution of wealth, the oppressions of the rich, the hopeless condition of the enslaved poor. Therefore the outcry for economic reform.

No doubt the condition of things in this regard, calls loudly for a reform of this kind. If we make allowance for some exaggeration in the tone of this complaint, we may hear it reiterated often enough, with a justifiable feeling of alarm—that the great corporations, the special interests, are engaged in schemes of corporate fraud, robbing the community and enslaving the working man, under cover of monopolistic organization, with which the law-making power of our country either criminally connives, or else, in stolid indifference, withholds its hand. But we should hesitate somewhat as to the premises on which the impeachment is based, and the manner in which our remedy should be applied.

Here is an economic evil, and our political reformers imagine they go to the root of it, by framing and executing a system of legislative enactment that will deal with the evil at its fountain head. With the socialist, the remedy must be found in withdrawing the special interest from the privileged few, and vesting it in the people as a whole, on the sanguine assumption, that the people as a whole will not be unjust to themselves. This

is the famous "collectivism" that is at the heart of every socialistic system that deserves the name. It is antithetical to individualism, which is indiscriminately denounced as the bane of all just government among men, and to be disposed of, finally and summarily, by making the people actually sovereign over themselves, as they now are only in name.

It is an insuperable objection to all this, that you cannot do away with individualism, without denying free will to man, and so taking away the foundation on which our sense of individual responsibility and justice must eternally rest. We must part with this, and take evolution in its stead. To do this, we get into a tangle that we cannot resolve. Our social ills are economic ills, and must look for a remedy only within economic bounds, and yet the individualism which the remedy is expected to dislodge, has its main distinction in a moral prerogative, of which, by supposition, the economic problem can take no note. Moreover, if evolution is to do the work for us, why urge co-operation on our part, when our ability to co-operate must imply the exercise of a free will, of which we have been theoretically and surreptitiously denied?

This brings us to our main postulate—that all reform, in its last analysis, is moral reform; that it must begin with the individual, or else it comes not at all. We must lay emphasis on this—tremendous emphasis, indeed—that the moral nature of man is at the root of his social and civic life, and that, if you reduce him to economics, and set him over himself in this ensemble, you are putting a rush scepter in a dead king's hand. All genuine reform is moral reform, and its semblance or verisimilitude in the outside world, is but the flitting phenomena of a passing day. After the long and rough experience of the ages, we have learned to close our ears against every theory, however plausible, of automatic reform, and to hope for the regeneration of society, only through the healing processes that must be set up, voluntarily, in the experience of the individual man.

Machinery cannot do it—put machinery to repairing machinery—what extremity of absurdity can be equal to that? The political philosophy of Mr. Carlyle has been summed up in this wise: "The moral regeneration of society is more important than any change in the machinery of government, and is, indeed, necessary to make any such change effective"—on which dictum

we do well to plant ourselves, with the resolute purpose never to be dislodged. All institutions, all forms of government, are plastic to the moral forces that come down on them from above, and to work reform without appeal to these forces, would be like working a lever from its small arm—from the points of resistance, rather than from the vantage of power.

And, now, if we inquire, as we are fairly entitled to inquire, why the metapolitics of our day are so uniformly shy of the religion of Jesus, where they are not openly and blatantly opposed, we have a fitting answer in all that has gone before. Christianity is pre-eminently the religion of the will, and, as we have said, and are bound to repeat, there is no theory of political collectivism that does not, either avowedly or by implication, antagonize the freedom of the will. They all look, with open or closed eye, to historic evolution—whatever that may be—to bring in the new and radiant era of civic and economic equality, when all social and industrial wrongs shall be righted, and all the foul sources of our human misery finally foreclosed. Religion is to have no place in it—none at all—and, in an especial manner, it is cautioned to avoid all contact with the religion of the Son of Man.

But how about the so-called "Christian socialism," of which we are hearing so much in our day—the attempt to bring in the same political order, by having our Jesus and His kingdom take the lead?

Well, we must be frank to say, that the movement, inspired though it be by a generous and noble good will, is nevertheless, considered in the light of logical consistency, an amiable mistake. No such hybrid product is realizable in any hopeful propaganda for reforming the world. Socialism, in any rightful use of the term, is at opposite poles with Christianity—because, simply, Christianity rests with its whole weight on the free will of man, and on the moral order of the world that is implicated therein; whereas socialism, in any and every aspect of it, deliberately ties itself up to the principle of cosmic evolution, or some such impersonal process, which it holds to be the supreme arbiter in the affairs of men.

We have to consent that the great Master founded His kingdom on the highways of the world; His work was out-of-doors; He daily moved, for a series of years, among great crowds of

eager and excited people, whose curiosity He condoned, and upon whom he looked with impartial commiseration for the physical and moral wretchedness that was blighting their lives. But He never omitted to tell them, that His saving mission was with the individual soul; that, to make it available, He must force His way, through their unwilling multitudes, to some blind man or cripple that was wanting His help. The individual, the individual was the unit of His aim.

And surely this must be so, if we are to attach any meaning to the unique evangel which He published to the world. We have greatly misunderstood Him, if He did not teach the doctrine that there is no real reform, except from the initiative of the will and life of the individual man. At the heart of all His sayings, and His doings, as well, was the principle of the infinite valuation of the human soul—of the human soul, as such—in spite of the entail of sin and misery, hampering it round about, in this scene of disciplinary struggle underneath the stars. Through all this, He would lead it homeward, by taking it tenderly by the hand, and whispering into its ear the consolatory benison: "Be of good cheer, for I have overcome the world."

We can recall how this distinctive feature of Christianity was brought out, in the great debate on "Comparative Religion" but recently closed. The accredited expounders of the great ethnic religions, in amicable symposium assembled, agreed to put before the learned world in simple statement, the differentiating quality of the religions they respectively espoused, with the view of determining the rank each one should have in the devout estimate of the religious consciousness of the race. It need not be said, that the superiority of the Christian religion over all others was conspicuously apparent, without resorting to a labored or strenuous advocacy in its behalf. But it must be said, that its superiority over the Oriental religions, was seen at once to consist in its being pre-eminently an individualistic religion, whereas the Oriental religions were appropriately designated "religions of the mass."

Until Christianity came, the world was relying on outside helps; on institutions; on ritual; on sacerdotalism; on the incentives of solemn festive occasions, when priestly trumpets would call the people together in devout humiliation before the altars of their gods, and in penitential renewal of their covenant vows.

Christianity reversed this process. The individual conscience, the ethical will, was made responsible for any schedule of reform, whether pertaining to the inner experiences of the man himself, or to his concrete relations to the outside world.

But we must not infer from all this, that Christian people should withhold themselves from all those schemes of organized social amelioration, which would do what they can through the secular arm. These monstrous evils that come upon us from the prolific brooding of the money lust, and other lusts, that threaten the very vitals of our civic life,—in so far as they defy, and set at naught, the law of the land, should be made to feel the magisterial rigor and sanctity of that law. To this end legislation and police are of vital concern to all noble minded citizens who go to the polls. The Christian man is also a patriot, or he has no right to be called a Christian man. He needs only to be warned against following the lead of Utopia, in discharging his sovereignty at the polls—the fatal fallacy that legislation can do it all.

No, no, no—we can hardly credit our memory, that but recently grave political leaders were urging, that we find a remedy for all our ills, in making the polls a tribunal, instead of an electorate—a kind of court of final appeal. It involved the absurd postulate that our social life and fortunes were wholly and absolutely at the disposal of the State—as if there were no power in the world above that of the people at the polls. The polls a tribunal!—rather say, there is a mighty tribunal back of the polls, and back of all other tribunals that have been lawfully set up in the land, even those that crown the judiciary at the top of the scale. That tribunal is public opinion, the chastened sentiment of the nation, too subtle to get adequate expression, at any time, in any institution, or at any most advanced stage of the progress of the race. Public opinion is our morning star; our light; our hope; the auspicious gale that fills the sails of the ship of State, and insures it a safe voyage over perilous seas. But public opinion is above the most pretentious deliverances of political creeds, a moral ideal that hovers in advance of all progress, a light that lights the way of groping nations even when they will not attend.

It is the mission of the Christian Church to keep that moral ideal aloft, to minister to public opinion of the best she has; of

her personal righteousness; of her purity of purpose; of her unflinching devotion to all that is good and true; in all the diversified relations and duties of life, and so to become, in an effectively real sense, the salt of the earth and the light of the world. In this she should be powerfully co-ordinated by the religion of the household, and the moral training our children should have in our public schools.

Alas! that we should ever hear the complaint, that her pristine enthusiasms are on the decline; that the fires on her altars are burning low; that she shuts herself up in the seclusion of ecclesiastical walls, and refuses to seek out the outcast and the poor, the wretched and the wronged, the desperate and the diseased, with the view of lifting them up, and letting in upon their darkness and their misery the ineffable light of God, as it shines forth, in suffused tenderness, from the face and figure of the glorified Son of Man. We would fain answer every such imputation, with the resolute rejoinder: It is not so: It is not so.

Tacoma, Wash.

ARTICLE VII.

MODERN ATTACKS UPON THE CHURCH.

BY REV. J. C. JACOBY, D.D.

The Church has always had its assailants. Good and evil have always been standing foes. And in speaking of the "*Modern Attacks upon the Church*" we are simply eliminating from our consideration all the struggles and trials through which the Church has passed in its earlier experience. And be it remembered, however, that as the centuries have sped away into history these onslaughts upon the Church have changed only as the times and circumstances seemed to dictate. The same diabolical spirit has prompted them all. Let us emphasize the fact that the Church is a divine institution. We can not cleave too firmly to this truth of the Bible. Without elaborating this thought the statement of our Lord (Matt. 16:18), "Upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" should suffice to settle two things: (1) That the Church is divine—divine in its nature, character and operations. (2) That our Lord expected and, inferentially at least, predicted these attacks. But notwithstanding this let us note the fact that there is a human element in this divine institution and that this is naturally therefore prone to err and open to criticism.

By the Christian Church, as we propose to consider it in this discussion, we mean the body of Christian believers in their organic form or organization for Christian worship and work. As such the Church is not without fault and therefore not above reproach. That the Church has manifested her weakness in many ways and subjected herself to valid criticism we dare not deny. Neither dare we deny the fact that this weakness confessed by the Church on the one hand has given encouragement and strength to the enemy on the other. Nevertheless if it is true that "an honest confession is good for the soul," it is good for the Church to know her weakness in order better to fortify herself against assaults.

The source of these attacks and criticisms, to be sure, has always been grounded on some phase of unbelief. The world in

its state of unbelief has always been on the alert for some occasion of criticism or assault as a ground of justification for itself. Of this Dr. Samuel A. Ort, then president of the Wittenberg Theological Seminary, expressed his convictions more than a decade ago." (LUTH. QUAR., Rev. Vol. XXVI. 555) He said in part, "How can the Church best stem the current of the present popular skepticism? This is a timely question. There is much skepticism to-day in the world around us and in the Church. It is a bold and daring disbelief of those saving truths which characterize the gospel of Jesus Christ. Moreover, it is an alarming question. The inquiry made presupposes the fact that the tendency adverse to Christianity and the progress of evangelical religion, is not only rapidly developing but already exists in strength and is widespread in its influence, both among the irreligious and the professors of a religious faith. It is a high tide rolling over the land, and in its onward movement is unsettling the belief of many, and seriously endangering the prosperity of the Church." And then to make this point more specific, he asks the question, "Religious skepticism, the fact now in question, what is this? Doubt of the reality and truth of those divine acts and verities which constitute the biblical system of belief. Strictly speaking, it is an attitude of mind which is neither for nor against, neither affirms nor denies, and is best described by the well known word, Agnosticism. In the common usage of the term skepticism means infidelity, disbelief, both of which are resolvable into the unbelief of the heart, which is a prime characteristic of sin. Whatever be the sense in which the word is understood, it is in any case correct to say that skepticism produces, first, indifference to the truth; second, refusal to accept the truth; and third, positive opposition to the truth."

That such a state of things has existed in a measure within the Church and has served to give it greater prevalence without can hardly be questioned, and has afforded much ground for criticism by the world. But even this has been but the repetition of our Saviour's parable of the mote and the beam. (Matt. 7:3-5.)

But this tidal wave of unbelief with its associated forces had scarcely spent its strength, when another phase of unbelief wrapped in the mantle of so-called "Higher Criticism" made its invasion into the folds of the Church. The higher critics naturally resolved themselves into two classes, viz., the constructive and the

destructive. The former, after the most careful biblical research and the profoundest study of all tributary sources of knowledge pertaining to this subject, have confirmed the Scriptures as the Word of God. The latter have assailed every apparent weakness or discrepancy of the Scriptures and in every possible way impugned their inspiration. It is with the latter therefore which we have to do at this time.

In reference to this phase of "Higher Criticism" Dr. S. A. Ort says, "We are all familiar with its claims. Its logical outcome is unbelief. The legitimate conclusion has been drawn and stated by its leaders, Reuss, Keunen, and Wellhausen, and these conclusions are the same as those of Tom Paine and Voltaire. In the end higher criticism, like every form of disbelief, repudiates the incarnation. If the eternal Son of God was not manifest in the flesh, then the only true ground for the inspiration of prophet and apostle does not exist. Higher criticism finds that the sacred Scriptures are not inspired. It, hence, has no place for incarnation. If Jesus Christ is the incarnate Son of God, then in Him human nature is inspired and the revelation which God gives to man through Him is a revelation by inspiration. It could not be otherwise. The trend of higher criticism is skeptical, and the conclusion of its skepticism is to sweep away the very foundation of Christianity, the God-man, Christ Jesus. * * * The destructive teaching of the new criticism is pleasing speech to the natural man, and quickly moves him to say 'I always thought that was the truth about the old book, and now my judgment is confirmed by the discoveries of the latest critical science.' The old man is a persistent skeptic because he wants to be. The natural heart is prone to doubt."

But the strength of this tidal wave has been largely spent in a futile attempt to confuse religious thought and thus frustrate and hinder the progress of the more aggressive forces in Christian work. And in our judgment, instead of hindering the work, it has aided in stimulating a more thorough research into the original text of Scripture, as well as into all biblical literature, and has thus strengthened the Church rather than weakened it.

Instead of this more direct and positive assault upon the fundamental truths and principles of the Church, the more recent attacks have been largely against the superficial and worldly phases of the Church. These emanating from the same sources,

and actuated by the same motives have come through wholly different channels.

And just here some statements by Harry Emerson Fosdick, in an article in the *Atlantic Monthly* for December (1911), on "Heckling the Church" are suggestive. He says, "A perusal of current literature in reference to the Church reveals how much the rage it has become to censure the blunders of organized religion. There are fashions in magazine articles as well as in dress, and the present vogue is, by any means, to drub the Church. Recent essays in which, with force and cleverness, both friends and foes have pointedly remarked upon ecclesiastical failures,—how familiar are the titles, 'The Failure of the Church,' 'The Conflict of Religion with the Church,' 'Is Modern Organized Christianity a Failure?' 'The Ebb of Ecclesiasticism,'—all leave the impression, not only that there are grievous errors to be criticised, but that some people are having rare sport in criticising them."

And be it said to the shame of the Church that some of these "drubbings" administered to the Church have not been without some just cause. For amid her pel-mel rush onward with her manifold and complex organizations she has, here and there, lost sight of her vital means of wisdom and spiritual strength. But there are those which have attacked the Church with diabolical spleen. Speaking of these Mr. Fosdick says, "How many times have we been told of the laboring men's conventions that hissed the Church and cheered Jesus; of the trades-union leader who said, 'Christ is all right, but damn the Church;' or of that other proletarian who eclipsed them all in scorn, 'We used to hate and then we despised the Church,' he said, 'but now we ignore it.' How much gaiety also has been added to the mirth of nations by the English statesman who remarked, 'Do not attack the Church; leave it alone. It is the only remaining bulwark against Christianity.'"

Let us specify some of the open gates through which the enemy has entered the fold of the Church.

1. *Ecclesiastical schisms or Church divisions.* Why there should be thirteen or more divisions of the Baptists ranging all the way from "Old-two-seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarians" up to our most aggressive evangelical Christian workers in a common cause of saving the world; or why there should be twelve styles

of Presbyterians, and seventeen classes of Methodists, or nearly as many synodical bodies of Lutherans these modern "Babble Blatters" can not understand. That certain sects should be distinguished from others by the peculiar cut of their clothes, or shape of their hats, or by discarding of buttons for hooks and eyes; that little villages where every consideration of efficiency, economy and fraternity would dictate a single Church, should be split into a number of congregations where wretchedly paid ministers weakly dispense what some one has called "supernatural ventriloquism," certainly offers a mark too obvious to be missed. And the Church may not be able to resent what she so richly deserves. But while the Church may well be ashamed of her petty schisms she need not be discouraged as though she faced a problem peculiar to herself. Indeed, it may be that in the providence of God, these divisions, instead of real schisms, have been but multiplied companions of one mighty company to withstand the assaults of the common enemy. For never since the early apostolic period has there been such a unique and concerted effort for the saving of souls as exists at this time. Not therefore by way of apology, I dare say, but by way of drastic rebuke, Mr. Fosdick proceeds to say, "The anatomy of the soul is infinitely delicate, its healing how mysterious! Surely the body will offer clearer ground for agreement, and ministers to its good health need not bear party names. But what with allopathy, homeopathy, osteopathy? What of schools of health from vegetarianism to Fletcherizing, and quacks innumerable, one finds it difficult to see how medical sectarianism could be carried much farther. In one of our unusually intelligent communities many prominent citizens have been endeavoring for years to persuade allopaths and homeopaths to use the same hospital. Denominational loyalty in medicine here also has proven too strong and two hospitals are now required. 'If Presbyterians want a new church,' wrote one of the allopaths, 'they do not ask the Baptists to violate their convictions!' So do medical and theological sectarianism manifest alike the same elemental human traits." And so Mr. Fosdick wisely concludes on this point, "In every realm where a popular indictment is found against the Church, the fault, called by some ecclesiastical name, is still the common human folly from which no organization ever yet escaped."

2. *Her modern methods of evangelism as an evidence of pastoral weakening.*

That there have been objectionable features manifest in some of our modern evangelistic efforts can not be questioned; that there has been an undue resort to evangelistic revivals to the neglect of the persistent ordinary and direct personal efforts is likewise evident; that some of the methods employed and the policies pursued by some of our modern evangelists have been superficial and, in some instances, over sensational, has also been plainly in evidence; that some pastors have depended overmuch upon these special evangelistic efforts is equally evident. In short, that some phases of our modern evangelistic work have been open to criticism no candid mind will question. But for all this the Church with her ministry has received some substantial spiritual impetus and timely inspiration, as well as much numerical strength from the efforts of such sturdy and untiring evangelists as Charles G. Finney, famous for his logical and invincible presentation of the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, and from D. L. Moody, renowned for his simple presentation of the more practical truths of the Word as applied to every-day life, and from G. Payson Hammond and Thomas Harrison (the boy preacher), from Charles Yatman and Dr. L. W. Munhall, from W. E. Biederwolf and J. Wilbur Chapman, from R. A. Torrey, and Henry Varley, the English evangelist, and last, but by no means least, from the Rev. William Ashley Sunday, who, with an air of sarcasm, has been called the "Chivalrous Evangelist."

The fact is the Christian Church was cradled in evangelism. She has been constantly nurtured and inspired with new zeal and imbued with new unction by this work. And to-day she owes much to it for her present spiritual life and religious activity.

3. *Some of her modern methods of finance.*

That the Church has in a measure departed from the old Bible landmarks of "tithes and offerings" must be candidly admitted. And that she has been shorn of many of the spiritual blessings promised through Malachi (3:8-12) by substituting other methods than those there set forth, can not be denied. For God there set forth a fundamental truth in worship as a sort of challenge to the Church, which has brought untold blessings to all who have accepted it. And that it is only too true that socials

with their refreshments, receptions with their banquets, to say nothing of the suppers, bazaars and other modern substitutions for the simple scriptural mode of giving have unfavorably and materially affected the vital service of worship as it pertains to giving. Some one has said to our shame, "We resort to all sorts of ways and devices, many of them of questionable morality, to raise the funds to meet the expenses of our Churches, yet are seldom free from the burden of debt, and as seldom are doing the work we ought. * * * When a person can't pay he don't pray. If the average man did business like the Church does it, he would go bankrupt. That fact is a proof of the divinity of the Church, for if God didn't have a hand in it, it would surely go broke. I wouldn't trust a bank one month that had to have an oyster supper every little while to pay its cashier. The financial side of the Church is likewise the spiritual side." In short, to worship God with our tithes and offerings means the opening of the windows of heaven and the pouring out of blessings for which there shall not be room enough to receive. To substitute for this these modern human devices will mean the condition so graphically described by Haggai (1:6): "Ye have sown much and bring in little; ye eat, but ye have not enough; ye drink, but ye are not filled with drink; ye clothe you but there is none warm; and he that earneth wages, earneth wages to put into a bag with holes."

4. *Her attitude toward the social and civil problems of our times.*

To say that the Church is either a social or civil institution might, as a matter of course, be considered as "begging the question." But the fact, nevertheless, is that the Church is the mother of both. God instituted the Church as the head from which to administer His discipline, and from which to give direction to His people in all religious, social and civil matters. And as such it may not be too much to say that *the Church is the head of all government*. For in its original form the Church was the head of a theocratic government whose royal master was anointed by a servant of God, and whose chief counsellor was the prophet of God. Saul, the first king of Israel, was chosen and anointed by Samuel, the servant of God, and when, for his disobedience, he was rejected of God, Samuel bore the unwelcome message to him. David, the son of Jesse, was likewise called

and anointed by the same prophet, but when he sinned it took Nathan, the man of God, under divine authority, to say to him, "Thou art the man." And shall the Church do less for the State now than she did then? In short the Church, as the mother of every other institution, has always been the power behind the throne of the State. And history bears testimony to the fact that as the Church waned in her vital service, influence, and power, the State likewise weakened and degenerated. And when the Church was in the height of her prosperity, the State was in the zenith of her glory. Illustrations of this fact abound in history. The Israelitish kingdom was in the height of its glory when Solomon was reigning under the influence of divine wisdom and authority. The power of the State, since the period of the early "Church Fathers," was never in a more degenerate and lamentable condition than when the Church, wrapped in the mantle of her formalism and superstition in the early "teens" of her history lay entombed in darkness and despair. Indeed no greater service was ever rendered to the State than when Martin Luther declared freedom to the laity of the Church by nailing his famous "Ninety-five Theses" to the door of the Wittenberg Church, and challenged the power of the degenerate Church by publicly burning the "Papal Bull of Excommunication."

The "Declaration of Independence" of our great commonwealth was conceived, and born in the Church. And America has become the one great world-empire of all ages, because the Church of Jesus Christ, so imbued the corporate articles of her declaration of independence, and the spirit of the Lord so thoroughly permeated her being that, baptized as a Christian nation, she has become the one Christ-world-empire of all ages. As such her fundamental political principles are pre-eminently religious.

Do I hear then some of these modern assailants of the Church crying to her ministry, "Hands off of politics"? Did not Ahab accuse Elijah of meddling with his business when the Lord had ordered a drought at the hands of Elijah? Hear the words of his wicked accuser (1 Kings 18:17), "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" But Elijah's answer to Ahab remains a standing rebuke to these modern assailants of the Church: "I have not troubled Israel; but thou and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandment of the Lord, and thou has followed Baalim."

What! Turn over the State, to the world, and to the devil? As well turn our children over to the care of the world and the devil, as indeed some do, as turn our government over to the craft and graft of the wily politicians whose financial support is the brewery and the great corporate trusts of our country. Do the wine-bibbers raise the cry against the Church and her ministry as she flings to the breeze her national insignia—the Stars and Stripes—as the symbol of purity and loyalty, with her appeals for sobriety and order, social and political, let us remember that human forms possessed with unclean spirits came from their tombs in Gadara crying out against our Lord, “What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most High God?” The fact is that men possessed with “unclean spirits,” as diabolical as in the time of our Lord, are still living and abiding in their political tombs, and are just as ready to cry out against the Church now as against her incarnate Lord nineteen centuries ago. Nevertheless, it is the business of the Church still to be close to the helm of State, and to exercise a mighty hand in guiding her to safe national moorings.

But so much for the political attitude of the Church. Of her social problems I need not speak at length. The spirit of social fellowship in the Church has never been more pronounced, and the spirit of unity in concerted activity for Christ more in evidence than now. The bigotry of a few decades in the past has given place to genuine fraternity. And whatever conflicts we may still encounter between labor and capital will find their ultimate settlement in the light of Bible teachings and in the spiritual and social fellowship of the Church where men are taught to love their neighbor as themselves.

But what need to say more on this subject than barely call attention to the fact, as mentioned by Mr. Fosdick, that “In every realm where a popular indictment is found against the Church, the fault, called by some ecclesiastical name, is still the common human folly from which no organization has ever yet escaped. Even in the most bitter and monstrous charge against the movement founded by Jesus, that preachers fawn and policies are pliant before the subsidizing power of wealth, *who without sin will dare cast the first stone?*” Governor Woodrow Wilson rightly expressed, in a recent address, his apprehension, because it is increasingly difficult to find, for the bench, men from the bar who

by their associations with corporate wealth have not lost all understanding of the people's needs. And then asks, "Who is bought up to-day for the service of wealth against common wealth, if not lawyers? Or, if you please, can the public press claim freedom from this sin? Shall the editors press the charge, as though clear-eyed, they saw the Church's mote? But are not their news trimmed and clipped, suppressed and twisted as the advertisers and owners say? And do they not notoriously write as they are paid rather than as they think? Professor E. A. Ross has well marshalled the facts in the *Atlantic Monthly* for March 1910 to show that the American press is the outstanding illustration of the saying, *He who pays the piper calls the tune.*" Mr. Fosdick adds, "Shameful and incongruous it surely is, that this and other charges should be true in some degree of the Christian Church; but this consolation at least she has, this assurance, that her problem is a common difficulty—to be solved in her as elsewhere by undiscourageable patience; that she can turn to every one of her accusers, whatsoever form of organized life they represent, and say, 'You're another!' But this answer does not solve the problem. It simply clears the ground for more positive and aggressive attitude on the part of the Church. The question is not so much, Who is faultless, but with all, *whose motives are purest and whose achievements the greatest?*"

To be candid have there been any organizations for good in which the Church has not had a leading part? And has she not been the first to place her veto on all organizations for evil? And has she not, notwithstanding all her weaknesses and shortcomings, left a record of achievements the like of which no other institution or organization can claim? Where is the institution outside of the Church which can lay claim to planting colleges and universities in this or other lands, and furnishing the asylums for people with all manner of human ailments? What was the power behind the emancipation of the slave? The Church! What is the mighty force which is driving, step by step, the demon rum from its strongholds? The Church! What has awakened the spirit of revolution and of justice and made political corruption tremble? The Church! What but the Gospel of the Son of God proclaimed by the Church has been and is now transforming heathen nations from their benighted condition into the

kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ? Let our modern fault-finders say what they may, it is through the Church that

“Jesus shall reign where’er the sun
Does his successive journeys run;
His kingdom stretch from shore to shore
Till moons shall wax and wane no more.”

Wellington, Kan.

ARTICLE VIII.

SOME HARMFUL RESULTS OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY REV. ADAM STUMP, D.D.

According to the terms of our theme we need not disprove all the claims of the dominant school and modern isagogics. As far as the aim of this paper goes, these might be correct. We are concerned only with results.

However, we must at the outstart, emphatically deny the wide scope which the higher criticism has arrogated to itself. It can not legitimately lay claim to all the credit for the progress of biblical hermeneutics in our day. As the lower criticism is limited to the consideration of the text, or the examination of documents, so as to obtain, as nearly as possible, the autographic words of the sacred writers, so the higher, in strict definition, must be limited to the *literary* construction, the syntax and style, of the manuscripts. It can not lay claim to a monopoly of the present day *historical* and *archeological* research. On account of our latest excellent Greek editions and English translations, textual criticism has receded into the background, but, for various reasons, the higher looms large upon the stage of modern thought.

But after all the boasts of its most ardent advocates are candidly considered, it can not be granted that the vast majority of the latest discoveries of history and archeology, or the richer exposition of the text, are due to the higher critics alone. If not one of their number had written a single line, we still would have made the same progress which the spade and the decipherment of old monuments and our greater knowledge in all directions have made possible. Only in one way has this method done any good: its negation of the traditional view has stirred up research in the orthodox ranks. The scholarship of the attack has provoked scholarship in the defense. Thus great benefit has come to the Bible. But what mousers in dusty libraries and delvers in old tombs have done does not belong to the credit of higher criticism as such. The advantage came in spite of it.

The old book was challenged and its champions proved its integrity and are proving it more and more clearly every day.

In the field of the languages and the style of its writers, in the sphere of the human elements of inspired men, the Bible as pure literature, modern investigation has broadened and enlightened our understanding, but this is only a fraction in the onward march of Scriptural elucidation. Voltaire and Paine also stimulated the truth by their opposition to it, but no virtue is to be attributed to them on that account. The fruit did not fall from the tree of their infidelity.

But we are to note some of the harmful results of the higher criticism.

We first mention its harm to scholarship itself. As the sum of mental attainments, the accumulation of knowledge, as the acquired ability to gather the minutest facts of a science and to classify them, we must admire that honorable and coveted term. Nor is this all. We owe a debt of gratitude to the patient scholarship of all times and lands for the discovery of truth and the advancement of civilization, intelligence and religion in the human race. But scholarship, in order to be a blessing, must be authoritative. By this we do not mean that it speaks dictatorially, but with the force of truth and fact. But our submission to it must be altogether voluntary. In these days of specialism, when the general encyclopedic knowledge of a past age is no longer possible, we should be justified in simply accepting the word of students in exclusive lines of research. We should be able to adopt without question the opinion of an architect or a chemist, and we usually can. When we want an exposition of the constitution of the United States we can confidently rely upon Story, Webster, or Kent. These are authorities. Now, can we thus implicitly rely upon the report of the specialist called the higher critic? Never! They have too often deceived us by their generalizations, too little have they agreed among themselves, and their disposition has been entirely too supercilious and their associations too dogmatic to inspire confidence in their conclusions. They have too often published as facts things which turned out not to be facts, too often exaggerated the significance of real facts, too often drawn inferences which the facts in the case did not warrant, too often as a class reversed their own dicta, and thus they have created distrust of all

scholarship. Without further personal investigation, we can not accept a single statement which any given higher critic has made. All this is a real harm to such as have and should have a docile reverence for assured learning.

A strong dialectic, such as Paul employed, is a part of the finest scholarship. But it so happens that most German critics are as silly in an argument as were the sophists of the times of Socrates. There is more logic in one Scotch Prof. Orr than in a hundred Prof. Harnacks. Happily for the traditional cause, the insanity of criticism reached its climax in Germany last year when Prof. Drews undertook to prove that Jesus was a myth, and thus their syllogistic cone, standing upon its apex so long, was overweighted, began to lean, and is now, under the attack of Prof. Zahn, toppling over, never again to be set up, any more *than the ancient walls of Jericho shall be rebuilt*. Thus the higher criticism also casts discredit upon its own boasted method, namely, the scientific. We believe in that method. We think it should be applied to all branches of learning. It stands for world-embracing investigation, exact definition, classified knowledge, and logical conclusions. Of these, the last is its most useful quality, because it should mean the truth toward which all the others tend, its beautiful, satisfying fruit. But this is the very direction in which the modern school of biblical criticism mostly fails. As Prof. Orr, in his "Problems of the Old Testament," shows, it often bases a generality on two, or even on one, fact. What right had Prof. Harper to insert a line into the Hebrew text of Amos? For what reason, except the most arbitrary one, should Harnack, and others, delete Luke 2:34-35 from the Greek text? There is not a scintilla of evidence against this classical passage of the Virgin Birth of Christ. It is clear that such an illogical procedure casts suspicion upon the entire scientific method—the only one which the modern mind professes to employ to regulate the processes of human thought. Thus would the Pythia saw off the legs of her own divining stool!

The second harm that comes from the camp of the higher criticism is a cowardly apologetic. As long as Christianity will be under attack, its advocates will rise up in its defense. Numerous apologists have entered the lists to contend for the fundamentals of religion in general and for the divine origin of Christianity in particular, the vindication in each age taking its

color from the nature and circumstances of the assault. As the enemy has surrounded our citadel and left no point unassailed, the story of apologetics presents a rather kaleidoscopic picture. What was a splendid artillery defense in one generation is only a heap of scrap-iron in another. Christianity and its books are ever subject to attacks from new positions. In our day there is no dangerous frontal charge but a flank movement from the direction of physical science and literary criticism. But most of the modern objections against the reliability and truthfulness of our Scriptures are merely puerile faultfinding based upon the unproven theory of evolution and imaginary criteria of literary valuations. The higher criticism professes to rise in defense. But the weakness of its apologetic lies in the fact that it seeks to appease the foe by surrendering to him. It argues to give up the traditional view as a stumbling-block in the way of the intellectuals, to yield the supernatural and to retain only the ethical, to cast overboard the virgin birth and even the resurrection, yea, the entire miraculous element, so that rationalists may not be offended by the Gospel.

Our religion is to be trimmed down until it will no longer require any faith to accept it, until, in fact, it shall be on a level with the ethnic religions of the world. We are to present to the human race, not really a religion at all, but only a moral code which, in comparison with others, is indeed par excellent, but nevertheless, also like them without divine sanction. But Christianity is first of all a supernatural revelation, or it is nothing. And to agree that it is inspired only as all great literature is inspired is to lower it to the level of a merely natural religion, sprung from the brain of priestly genius and gradually developed with the needs and intelligence of the race. To do all this for the purpose of making it palatable to sceptical minds is to let down the draw-bridge and deliver the keys to the hostile investors, for the sake of peace. But under such conditions the cost would be too great for the purchase. An enemy never long respects a compromise; much more does he despise a ready capitulation. Not by begging for the privilege of existence, but both by passive and by aggressive conquest has Christianity heretofore won its way to success. So it will do in future and the proposal of the higher critics is a false apologetic. It spells foreordained defeat. Our victories as protagonists of "the faith

which was once delivered to the saints" (Jude), must be won, not by weak compliance, but by strenuous combat and conservative edification.

A third harm resulting from the higher criticism has come in the form of a lowered reverence for the Bible as the Word of God. The pious young King Edward would not allow his playmates to stand on the sacred volume, but modern criticism has not hesitated to place its feet upon every page, to stamp out whatever does not suit its fancy. The twentieth century Jehudies are mercilessly free with their pen-knives. The very fact that the Bible is spoken of and treated only as literature tends to its depreciation. To place Homer and Shakespeare on the same shelf with it and familiarly to speak of it in the same breath is to make it common. But the very fact that a book has the air of divine revelation about it, and affords evidence of its non-earthly origin, gives it the character of a thing apart, not indeed as an object of bibliolatry, but as the sacred depository of celestial oracles. But the new science of comparative religion, though granting Christianity the superior place, has classed The Book with the pandects of Confucius, the vedas of India, and the Koran, thus taking away that halo of sanctity with which our childhood had invested it. To many minds it has become only a book, instead of the Law of the Lord, and the channel of His Spirit. The higher criticism has pulled it down from its solitary niche and placed it into too close proximity to detracting companionship.

The worst harm that the higher criticism has done the Old Testament comes from the claim that much of it was concocted as a pious fraud. There is no agreement, among them, some critics claiming that the book which Hilkiah, the priest, said he had found in the temple during Josiah's reign he had only pretended to discover, that it was a product of priestcraft which was purposely secreted there and then imposed upon the king and the nation as "the book of the law," or as an inspired volume. Others argue that it is a composition of the Exile and imposed by Ezra upon a credulous age as the Word of God. This fraud, they hold, does not include the older prophets, except the messianic additions, but especially the hexateuch. According to this theory, the Bible started as a falsehood, was believed as a falsehood, was upheld by Christ as a falsehood, and still exists

as a falsehood, beside which Bacon's cryptic Shakespeare would be an innocent joke and Homer's alleged plagiarism a child's harmless puzzle. Then the book, which above all others, inculcates sincerity and truthfulness would be a monstrous fabric of hypocrisy. Then the finest code of morals in the world has been conceived by the most unethical brains that ever perpetrated pious chicanery. Who could any longer respect such a boasted child of literature? None. Hence the Bible is to-day, in many circles, a much discredited book. Yet this momentous position lacks all adequate proof and can seem true only to that self-centered subjectivism which can demonstrate anything to itself, to its own satisfaction, and then arbitrarily demanded belief in its fanciful phantasmagoria. But it must be remembered that a magic lantern can not work its delusions unless all lights, except its own, are extinguished!

But the higher criticism has also done harm to the reputation of Christ. It has manifested its greatest zeal and put forth its most vigorous efforts to cast discredit upon those passages which record his miraculous conception and his virgin birth. According to his slanderous Jewish enemies and the radical critics he either was a prematurely born son of Joseph or altogether a half-pagan bastard,—a scurrilous story which even Haeckel, in his "Riddle of the Universes," first adopted but later discarded. The miracles, according to this view are mostly idle legends. As for his resurrection, that is a beautiful Easter message, but not a fact—only an illusion of ardently enthusiastic discipleship. The passion of a woman, as Renan said, gave us a God!

Though denouncing the old dogmas and professing to have none of their own, these critics turn theologian with a vengeance and teach such an exaggerated kenosis, as to make Christ an ignoramus, who did not know who the authors of the Old Testament books were. So they also carry the doctrine of accommodation to such an extent as to make Christ appear as a charlatan, who was all things to all men in the lowest sense, so that he winked at the frauds which the Pentateuch had long embodied. Thus either no man ever labored under a more pathetic delusion or practiced a more heinous imposture, than the professedly sinless Nazarene did, when on the way to Emmaus, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." (Luke

24:27). If the critics are correct, what a sublime egotist, what an olympic religious mountebank Jesus Christ must have been! Yet hundreds of his contemporaries, in spite of their previous incredulity, were persuaded to love him as good and to worship him as divine!

But who of us could accept such a person, as the Wellhausen school depicts, as his Redeemer and Lord? Who could discover anything worthy of worship in such a character? If he was divine only in the sense that he had a higher knowledge of God than all others have, how does that fact give him a place in the holy Trinity or authorize him to say, "I and the Father are one." (Jno. 10:30); or, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father?" (Jno. 14:9). But these high claims are recorded only in John's gospel, although their equivalent occurs once in the synoptists. (Matt. 11:25-30). Hence all the enginery of erudition's warfare has been, for years, bombarding the lonely exile on Patmos, but without avail. He has not been dislodged from his impregnable place.

But it is the supreme purpose of the higher criticism to prove that Jesus was a mere man, and far from a perfect one at that. Hence he topples from the high place to which millions, many of them the most gifted intellects, have exalted him as the sole exemplar of the race. Hence he is being classified with the philosophers and moralists of the world, among whom he is indeed acknowledged to be *facile princeps*, but where he just as surely loses his office as the Savior of men. All Unitarianism has flocked to the standard of the higher criticism as to a new hope for its falling towers. But all the hordes of infidelity also have hastened to its ranks and taken up its slogan. Its language is that of Tom Paine, and even Bob Ingersol would find comfort at its altar. Thus our Christ has been brought to the level of a Buddha and a Zoroaster, yea, even of a Hillel and a Socrates. Yet even a Rousseau could cry out: "If Socrates died like a philosopher, Jesus Christ died like a God!"

The harm which I shall mention last follows, as a matter of course, from the preceding considerations. The higher criticism fosters scepticism in religion. The most injurious enemies of Christianity always have been, not of the alien camp, but of its own household. One false son has hurt the old home more than a thousand atheists. Nothing is so sweet to the ears of the

assaulting foe, just leading the forlorn-hope against the citadel, as the news that trusted friends are battering down the walls from the inside. This gives him fresh courage.

The most humiliating condition of our present day conflict is, that our most efficient opponents are professing Christians. In the very act of throwing up their hands in token of surrender to the enemies of the Bible, they protest: "We are its friends!" The most telling weapons against Christ and his Church are forged upon her own anvils. Many theological seminaries are fertile schools of infidelity and many pulpits give forth an uncertain sound.

The first man who ever caused doubt concerning the Scriptures in the mind of your speaker was Rev. John William Coleman, a Christian Bishop. The weak dialectic of atheism and the frivolous carplings of hair-brained sceptics made little impression, but when a minister of the gospel attacked his own text-book it was enough to make a young student sit up and take notice. This is the pathos of the whole matter. Christianity is a divided army, not only among its denominational masses, but also among many of its thinkers, its grinding scholars. There is treachery at headquarters. Without faith the Christian religion will be of no effect. It was with their creed as their only weapon, that the apostles and their followers dethroned the Caesars and won the pagan world for Christ; now a dessicated gospel is to uncrown the Son of God himself. But this is the inevitable result of undermining credence in the genuineness and authority of the Church's manual of doctrine, life, and worship.

As a sample of the practical outcome of the modern school let us glance at the notes which Prof. Willett writes in the *Homiletic Review* on the current Sunday School lesson (1911). Just as Henry VIII has found a whitewashing apologist in Froude, so Jereboam, the son of Nebat, has found one in this Chicago professor. Upon the prophetic condemnation of the golden calves he comments thus: "It must be recalled, however, that the standards of the later Deuteronomic reformation are here applied, rather than those of the age." (p. 52.) In other words on the mere assertion of this writer we are to believe that Solomon and his immediate successors did not have the Decalogue. In his opinion Jereboam was quite a saint, who did not in any man-

ner intend to "displace the worship of the God of Israel." The fact that the pedagogic princes of Jehosaphat used "the books of the law of Jehovah" does not in the least disturb this son of the critics. He justifies his own inconsistency, which the mention of this book exposes, with the oracular remark that it "suggests the confusion of this mission with that of Josiah, after the discovery of the law-book in the temple."

When Elijah and Elisha crossed the Jordan on the way to the former's translation, the waters did not part for their feet, but "later generations loved to believe it was not in the accustomed manner, but on dry ground, at the magic touch of Elijah's mantle." (p. 222). This echo-of-the-German-critics' account of Jonah's voyage toward Tarshish reminds one of Mark Twain. He relates: "But disasters fell upon him, and he was compelled, by events which are only minor incidents in the story, to return to his home." (p. 308). It is thus that the whale also swallows Willett, so that in its dark belly, with its peristaltic noises, he can neither see nor hear the sign of which Jesus Christ has spoken. (Matt. 12:39, 40; Lk. 11:29, 30.)

The account which Prof. Willetts gives of the finding of the law in Josiah's time (2 Chron. 34:14 f) is as follows. He thinks it was originated by the loyal priests and prophets of the dark days of Manasses' reign, at least half a century previous. "These good men," he proceeds to say, "the defenders of the ancient faith, felt the need of a new and more drastic expression of the law forbidding the worship at any place except Jerusalem. They were conscious of the fact that if Moses were alive, he would enforce just such a law, considering the evils of the age. They seem, therefore, to have drawn up a new body of law in the name of the great lawgiver of the past, whose spirit and purposes they now interpreted afresh to the nation. They spoke everywhere in this collection of laws in the name of Moses, and they organized all the institutions of the past and the present around the one great principle of centralization at Jerusalem. Then, having no chance, in the dark days of heathenism to promulgate the law, they laid it away in the sanctuary where a new generation might find and proclaim it." (July 1911, p. 56). Such in the language of one of their own fawning disciples is the fraud theory of Deuteronomy which, in spite of the pious falsehood

involved, the higher critics justify on the ground that the end sanctifies the deed.

According to this commentator, all the miracles in the lives of the Prophets are only popular legends which affection and gratitude have woven into their biographies. But he insists that the moral teaching of these stories, even if they are but *pretended* history, is beautiful and precious! Now instruct the children of this generation as this Chicago professor has been instructing us, and in the next you will not have enough men and women who will think it worth while to study Old Testament lessons at all!

The rationalism of the eighteenth century did not do great injury as long as it was in its academic stage among doctrinaires, but when it became vulgar and corrupted the minds of the common people, it made havoc of piety. So to-day the very suspicion that there is doubt among our scholars is weakening faith in certain groups of men. The newspapers and magazines are spreading the contagion. There is an epidemic of scepticism in many of our pews. Once more the tares have been sown among the wheat grains. "An enemy hath done this." (Matt. 13:28). What shall the harvest yet be?

But while in America we may yet have to reap the full results of this liberalism, in Germany the worst seems to be over and reaction has already set in. Drews during his public lectures was almost mobbed by the populace, who resented the insults which he heaped upon our Saviour and the gospel writers. A few months ago one of the propagandists of the cult confessed that the cause of liberalism, as judged by the comparatively small number of subscribers to its periodicals and the greater popularity of the evangelical pulpits, is doomed to failure. Courageous scholars are coming to the rescue. The greatest books of the century on the subject is that of the erudite Zahn. His "Introduction to the New Testament" undoubtedly will mark the great divide between the rise and fall of the destructive critical school, which began with the obscene Astruc in 1753.

The so-called higher criticism rests upon false premises for which human nature will not abidingly stand—namely, that all Scriptural problems are to be solved by the criteria of consciousness, the moral faculty, reason and experience.

According to these four principles every man becomes a law

to himself. He is above the word and judges it. He tries everything in the alembic of his religious feelings and rejects everything that does not stand that test. This is the old method of mysticism, which having always failed in the past is foreordained to failure in the future.

According to this method, men do not hesitate to employ the decalogue or the mount sermon to condemn other things in the Bible. Prof. Willetts calls Elisha's "death-dealing curse upon the irreverent youths of Bethel" an "immoral incident." (Hom. Rev. Mar. 1911, p. 223). But if the human conscience is to become the guide of the race, we will suffer great confusion, for in some places and times the Duke of Alva, in others Benvenuto Cellini, and in still others St. Francis of Assisi shall be guide and arbiter!

But this *ignis fatuus* has misled souls long enough in the quagmires of delusion. It is the blind leading the blind and both falling into the ditch.

As for reason, history proves that, like the stars of the dawn, its light grows dim as the sun of heaven arises. Greece is an example of the fact that it never illuminated a culture, religion, or civilization, which did not decay. We might as well expect the glow-worm to turn night into day as to expect the world to be saved by rationalism. Wherever uninspired reason has groped, wreck and ruin have followed in its wake. A divine revelation alone is the hope of man, the only anchor of the soul on life's stormy sea. And of this divine anchor, the so-called higher criticism would fain rob our tempest tossed ship and let it drift pitilessly toward an unknown shore.

York, Pa.

ARTICLE IX.

THE GROUND AND NECESSITY OF THE MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE.

BY PROFESSOR EDWARD PFEIFFER.

In our quest for the ground and necessity of the missionary enterprise we are carried up to the celestial heights of the love of God that passeth all understanding. The love of God as revealed in the redemption of the world through Christ Jesus is both the vital source of the missionary enterprise and its abiding motive. To stop short of this ultimate ground in our apprehension of the subject and our application of its principles in the practical work is to limit our vision, and sooner or later to cripple effort.

Much is said nowadays about the changed viewpoint of our age and the shifting of emphasis from things that are heavenly and eternal to the things that are earthly and temporal. The age upon which we have entered is intensely practical and utilitarian. We are told that the people of to-day are interested in living issues and social problems rather than in the deeper verities of what some are pleased to call speculative theology. Tangible and speedy results are sought, and to attain them appeal is made to interests and motives that are not vitally related to the deeper spiritual ground of our salvation. It is for us Lutherans, the children of the great Reformation, with our hereditary reverence for the Word of life, to discern the error and avoid the danger that lurks in this modernized gospel of philanthropy and altruism.

Our conception of the character and scope of the missionary enterprise will determine—will mold, and may modify, our view as to the ground and necessity of the enterprise. If in our conviction and practice the missionary enterprise never ceases, in any of its departments and phases, to be the application of the Gospel of Christ to those who must perish without Him, the realization of His redemption in reclaimed souls and regenerated communities at home and abroad, we shall never fail to find its ultimate ground in the infinite love of God who gave His Son to

be the propitiation for our sins and for the sins of the whole world, and from that ground of our salvation will never cease to flow the necessity and the urgency of constraining love to seek and to save that which is lost. If, on the other hand, we suffer ourselves to be lured away from this Biblical position, and to be enchanted by the modern popular and (to the natural mind) appealing view of the kingdom of God as essentially a rule of civic righteousness, justice, and brotherhood, with an incidental admixture of religious tenets and spiritual aspirations, our view of the ground and necessity of the humanitarian enterprise will become correspondingly broad and shallow.

I trust that on this phase of our subject there are no dissenting views among us. And yet, in view of the prevalence of this popular conception of the kingdom of God, in view of the insidious nature of its appeals, in view of actual conditions with which we have to deal both in our foreign and in our inner mission work, it is worth our while to pause in our present discussion, if only to point out the nugatoriness of this claim and aim.

I. *The missionary enterprise, to put it briefly and tersely, consists not in social transformation, but in spiritual regeneration of individuals and communities.*

The aim of Christian missions is clearly expressed in the Great Commission: "Make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." The aim is evangelization, the Christianization of the nations. The aim is salvation from sin and death—salvation for time and for eternity. The kingdom which Christ established, and which the missionary enterprise is to extend unto the uttermost parts of the earth, is essentially a spiritual kingdom: righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." In these words Christ has given us a principle of His kingdom which teaches us to distinguish between the essential and the incidental, and, in our mission work, to discern the proper relation between temporal good and the eternal riches.

It is at this point that the humanitarian and naturalistic Christianity of our day reveals its radical and fatal departure from the Gospel of Christ and from apostolic Christianity. The

kingdom of God is represented as a moral and religious development of mankind, and naturally the humanitarian element predominates to such an extent as to practically hide from view the divine factor of redemption from sin. As this idea of the kingdom of God as being largely or wholly a kingdom of this world becomes more and more prevalent in society and in the literature of the day, as it permeates much of present day Christianity, as it is gradually making its influence felt in some circles of the missionary propaganda, are we going to yield to the specious illusion, in our church work at home and in our mission work abroad? There is strong temptation to yield. There is some danger of our yielding in practice, if not in doctrine and confession.

In foreign mission work, for example, are we going to allow education in secular things and natural sciences, industrial training, medical ministrations, and the like, needful and helpful, beneficial and blessed as these activities are, and perfectly legitimate in their proper place,—are we going to allow them in any wise to dim our vision or paralyze the arm of our spiritual energies in behalf of that which is vital in the missionary enterprise? In our inner mission work, which necessarily includes a large proportion of ministries in things physical and temporal, where the relief of bodily ills and the removal of physical and moral wrongs claim so much attention, where the betterment of social and industrial conditions may be a stepping stone to evangelization, are we going to allow ourselves to lose sight of the vital and fundamental distinction between philanthropy and Christianity, between social transformation and spiritual regeneration? and of the transitoriness of the former, and the incomparable, eternal value of the latter?

If we yield to this popular tendency of supplanting the old, victorious Gospel of Christ by the humanities of to-day, and in proportion as we yield, it is certain that our grasp of and our grip upon the eternal ground and necessity of the missionary enterprise will gradually weaken, as it loses divine vitality and potentiality and becomes imbued with human frailty and sentimentality.

In an article in the last quarter of the *International Review of Missions*, Principal Garvie, expressing his regret and apprehension in view of the fact that some of his brethren abroad are be-

ing attracted by the liberal Christianity of the destructive critics, declares: "I do not believe that the impoverished gospel which the radical criticism leaves us is adequate for any length of time, amid the strain and stress of the foreign field, so much more severe than at home, to sustain the vitality of the faith or the vigor of the service of the missionary." Are we not justified in going further and declaring that such an impoverished gospel lacks the power of sustaining living faith and of fostering missionary life and activity in our home churches? "You must have great love for humanity," said a gentleman one day to a deaconess whom he met on his visit at a hospital where most loathsome diseases were being treated. "Great love for humanity," said the deaconess, looking up at him; "that would not be able to keep us here a single day. It is the love of Christ that constraineth us."

II. *The missionary enterprise, as planned of God, inaugurated by Christ, and promulgated by His apostles, is grounded in the redemption of mankind through God's only begotten Son, and from this ground flows the perpetual necessity of the enterprise, whose aim and mission is to bring the blessings of that redemption to all men for their present and eternal salvation.*

It is not possible, within the limits of a brief hour's discussion to unfold in its length and breadth and depth the Scriptural ground of missions, or to elaborate upon the distinction that may properly be made between ground and necessity. Our limited time will be more profitably employed, I think, if we confine our attention to the more practical phases of the subject. For this purpose, ground and necessity may be regarded as practically equivalent, and our task may resolve itself into a consideration of the question: *Why must we Christians carry on missions?*

What is the ground of the necessity of the missionary enterprise? In reply I would say:

First, the missionary enterprise of the Church is necessary on account of the dire need of mankind.

Whether we can understand and realize the depth of man's natural corruption or not, we accept with our Lutheran Confessions and implicitly believe God's declaration on the subject in His Word of truth which shall never pass away. Sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. That is the dreadful fact, the condition of dire need and extremity, declared in Scripture, con-

firmed by human experience, exhibited in all the history of the human race. There is no essential difference among men on this score. Whatever differences and gradations there may be in the manifestations of sin, whether refined or brutal, the *catastrophe* implied in the words, *sin and death*, has engulfed people of all classes, the cultured and the barbarous, the learned and the ignorant.

To those who have eyes to see, this fact is evident enough in the nations where Christianity has been the dominant religion for centuries. It is far more glaringly evident among the nations and tribes that for centuries and ages have been left to grope and grovel without the light and the truth of the Gospel. What ancient heathenism had become in the time of Christ is portrayed by St. Paul in the first chapter of his letter to the Romans. And the true character of naked, unvarnished heathenism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been set before us in graphic reality by missionaries who have sacrificed their lives and all in the work of evangelizing the heathen. It is not from the men and women who have seriously faced the problem and shunned no sacrifice for its solution that we hear glib talk about the happy heathen in their native state and the suggestion that they be unmolested by efforts to Christianize them.

No, no. As during the ages past, so now, even amid the enlightenment and civilization of this twentieth century, from India and Japan, no less than from Central Africa and the still cannibal islands of the South Seas, from the slums and haunts of iniquity and woe in our populous centers, comes the cry, uttered, and more often unexpressed, but none the less real because mute: Come over and help us! Come to our rescue!

The varied need, so all-prevailing, so deep-seated, so virulent, calls not for alleviation and palliation merely, but for healing, for salvation from sin, for peace in life and hope in death. Where can effectual help and healing be found? We are ready to reply: In the Gospel of Christ, for in Him alone is there life and salvation. But before taking up this reply we must briefly consider some counter claims. In view of these, I affirm:

Secondly, the missionary enterprise, established and directed by Christ, the Captain of our salvation, is necessary on account

of the inadequacy and utter insufficiency of all natural religions, heathen cults, and human philosophies.

By their fruits ye shall know them. It is hardly possible that even a serious-minded agnostic would claim that the base and debasing religious rites and superstitions of fetish worshippers and animists have proved themselves adequate to elevate their devotees morally and religiously, or to bring peace to their souls. And while the study of comparative religions may have discovered evidences of development here and there from lower and more primitive to higher forms of natural religion, this has not been to any appreciable extent the result of the investigations and observations of the missionaries who have spent their lives not in evolving theories, but in meeting actual conditions. Take, for example, the lucid and scholarly presentation of John Warneck in "*The Living Christ and Dying Heathenism*," the outgrowth of some fifteen years of missionary labor among the Battaks of Sumatra. Pursuing his observations and studies not on the basis of religious and historical presuppositions, nor in consonance with the dominant hypothesis of evolution, but under the stress of conditions as he actually found them, the "brutal facts" forced upon him the conviction, that "animistic heathenism is not a transition stage to a higher religion." He found in animism "only incontestable marks of degeneration." The fascinating hypothesis of the theorists, he says, "contradicts the picture of real heathenism which every one gets, from familiarity with it, who does not look at it through colored spectacles." And so a dispassionate study of heathen religions generally shows that they have not been rising to higher and purer conceptions of God, but have been degenerating, leaving the deepest needs of the soul unsatisfied, as religions even fostering obscenity and pollution, as does Hinduism, and ministering to cruelty and lust, as does Islam.

Even the beautiful sentiments which men have discovered—which Christian missionaries have pointed out to Brahmans and other native scholars who were ignorant of their existence—in the Vedas and other "sacred writings" of the East, have left no impress for good upon the people at large. The best that is in them has been powerless to promote purity, progress, and peace. Hinduism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism have, in sheer self-defense, purloined Christian ideas and methods in hopes of main-

taining religious forms that have proved to be effete and sterile. In the history of missions, and the conflicts of Christianity with heathenism, ancient and modern, those who are open to conviction and are candid enough to weigh evidence must be impressed with the utter incapacity of the ethnic religions to effect a moral transformation, not to speak of a spiritual regeneration, of the peoples over whom they have held sway. From this point of view the work of Confucius, Gautama, and Mohammed, together with the lesser prophets of the nations, has proved to be a complete failure.

Thirdly, we put forth the claim, with all the assurance of a triumphant faith, that the missionary enterprise is necessary because of the sufficiency of Christianity, and because it alone has the divinely appointed means of bringing salvation to the nations.

The claim that Christianity is the absolute and only saving religion may seem arrogant and audacious to those who hold other faiths and have never known Christ and the power of His resurrection. So it appeared to the gentlemen of Athens, to Roman emperors and governors, and to heathen philosophers of old. But within a few decades it had permeated society with its new life, was preached in all parts of the Roman empire, and became the dominant religion of the world.

We Lutheran Christians accept the Bible as God's infallible and immutable Word. Loyalty to Christ and fidelity to His Word are distinguishing marks of the Lutheran Church. We prove ourselves true children of the Reformation if we hold that heritage not only confessionally, but in deed and in truth, not as a badge and banner merely, but as a real possession and in practice. It has a very direct bearing upon mission work.

With St. Paul, we are not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. We have unwavering confidence in the power of the Gospel to save even unto the uttermost. We believe that there is no salvation apart from Christ and His atonement for sin, for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. If these truths have taken profound hold upon us, how can we be indifferent toward the work of missions, the work of evangelization and mercy at our own doors and in

our immediate communities, and the same work among the unevangelized in distant parts?

I like that word "necessity" in this connection. It emphasizes the urgency of the call, the imperative duty devolving upon the Church in its corporate capacity, and upon every individual believer. And, what is more, it reminds us of the dynamic power of our faith, the spontaneous, irrepressible impulse to hasten to the rescue of mankind with the only adequate and successful remedy for its deepest ills and woes.

It is a source of inspiration to note that Christ our Lord and the great Apostle to the Gentiles realized that necessity, verified it in their own lives, and recorded it for our learning and encouragement. "*My meat* is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work," we hear our Savior say. And again: "*I must* work the works of Him that sent me, while it is day; the night cometh, when no man can work." (John 4, 34; 9, 4.) As for his personal ministry St. Paul disclaims any glory or praise, saying: "For *necessity* is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel." And again he says: "The love of Christ *constraineth* us." (I Cor. 9, 16; II Cor. 5, 14.)

What our confessions have to say about the necessity or voluntariness of good works is instructive and has a direct bearing on our subject. You know that long and bitter controversies revolved about this topic. The Formula of Concord explains at length the sense in which, according to the Gospel, good works are necessary, and refers to the frequent occurrence, in the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, of such expressions as these: "Good works are necessary;" they "should necessarily follow faith and reconciliation;" etc. The sixth article of the Augsburg Confession teaches that "this faith (as defined in the preceding articles) is bound to bring forth good fruits, and that it is necessary to do good works commanded by God." I refer to these statements because of the suggestive thoughts conveyed in the terms that are used. Good works are not voluntary in the sense of being optional. They are spontaneous, and yet necessary. There is a *debere* and *oportet*, a *soll* and *muss*, about them. But it is living faith in Christ that is bound to bring forth good fruits—*bonos fructus parere*. They are not, then, fruits hung on a tree in order to adorn it, but living fruits that are brought forth, begotten from within. Faith pushes its own

life out into works that are in conformity with God's will. There is no physical compulsion, no law from without, driving to the performance of the needful tasks, but there is impulse, pulsating life, necessity from within.

If we conceive of the necessity of the missionary enterprise in this truly evangelical sense, and if, having living faith and trust in our divine Redeemer, we will nourish and foster, feed and refresh, exercise and strengthen that faith, we will certainly not be wanting among those who are workers together with God in the evangelization of the world.

III. *In conclusion, permit me to express three thoughts that I find implied in this conviction with respect to the ground and necessity of the missionary enterprise.*

First, we *must* hold fast and be willing to contend for the integrity and the purity of the Gospel. Upon this depends the issue—the success of our missionary efforts and the permanence of the fruits. An impoverished, vitiated gospel will fail to sustain our personal faith and will sooner or later reduce the vigor of our missionary efforts.

Moreover, we *must* expand and intensify our missionary undertakings at home and abroad. Not because we have the missionary command of our Lord as an *order* to advance, but because that command is itself a fruit of Christ's redemption and shows us in what way our faith should bear good fruits. Let every synod forge ahead and be up and doing, not in the spirit of carnal rivalry, but in healthful and hearty emulation of that which is best and that which will abide; not for synodical glory and pride, which is a vain and fleeting thing, but to the glory of God in the world's evangelization in our several communities, throughout our land, and unto the ends of the earth.

"The restless millions wait
The light whose dawning
Maketh all things new:
Christ also waits.
But men are slow and late.
Have we done what we could?
Have I? Have you?

Finally, as Lutheran synods we *must* value our common heritage and labor in love to overcome the things that divide us, in order that we may the more effectually propagate the Gospel of the kingdom and extend that kingdom among men. To this end may the Lord grant His grace and the guidance of the Holy Spirit unto us all that we may learn ever better to understand His will, expound His Word in all its fulness, and faithfully apply it in our practice and life to the glory of His blessed name.

Columbus, Ohio.

ARTICLE X.

BEGINNINGS OF LUTHERANISM IN OHIO.

BY PROFESSOR B. F. PRINCE, PH.D.

By the treaty of Fort Stanwix made with the Iroquois Indians in 1768, a large tract of land was opened to settlement in Western Pennsylvania and other regions, reaching as far south as Eastern Tennessee. The lands in Western Pennsylvania were opened to purchase in 1769. They were much sought for by residents of the eastern part of the State and by adventurers from Maryland and Virginia. There were also Germans directly from the Fatherland who came into these regions desirous of making a home for themselves and their children.

These settlements were a back-ground for the pioneers who came later into the territory which afterwards became the State of Ohio. Though a few settlements had been made west and north of the Ohio River by 1790, but little was done toward building up the country until after the treaty of Greenville in 1795. The Indians of the North-West were very jealous for their country west of the Ohio River, and aimed at the exclusion of the whites from that region. The splendid victory of General Wayne at the battle of the Fallen Timbers dissipated their hopes and led them to cede more than one-half of the present State of Ohio to immediate settlement. People from New England States, from Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky and North Carolina came and occupied great stretches of land, subdued the forests and made homes for themselves and their posterity.

Some of the first Lutheran preachers in the State of Ohio began their work in Western Pennsylvania. In 1787 Johannes Stanch, later changed to Stough, crossed the mountains from Maryland and took up his residence in the Virginia Glades situated in South-western Pennsylvania. He came as a teacher and a layman. In common with other teachers who served in German settlements, he conducted religious services on Sunday afternoons at which he read a German prayer, and a German sermon. Because of this he was called by the people a preacher,

and was pressed to do a preacher's work. They argued if he could read sermons he could also read marriage ceremonies. In emergency he did so without authority from Church or State. Soon afterwards he obtained from the civil court the right to perform marriage ceremonies. After teaching for four years, Mr. Stauch in 1791 began the work of minister and pastor, though without license. In 1793 he presented himself before the Ministerium of Pennsylvania and after due examination was enrolled as a licentiate of that body. Though he appeared at the meetings of the Ministerium he was not ordained until 1804. Mr. Stauch was no doubt among the very first Lutheran ministers who served west of the mountains. He studied theology in his own cabin, and long before his death, was recognized as a faithful and strong preacher of the Word. He became a valuable pioneer missionary and laid the foundation of many churches in Ohio. He was the type of many useful men who became pastors in the Ohio field, men of limited education but of sterling qualities of mind and heart.

There were many adventurers and irresponsible preachers who visited and more or less disturbed the early churches of the West. They were without synodical connection, some of them capable, a few of them pious, but most of them merely seeking a place for the funds received and the advantages that might come from their position as preachers.

On such preachers the Ministerium of Pennsylvania kept a watchful eye. These adventurers were generally anxious to become members but could be admitted only after much scrutiny by that body. There were some splendid men among the first preachers in Western Pennsylvania, Revs. Lutze, Stauch, John M. Steck, G. A. Reichard and Jonas Mechling, who were pious and devoted servants and laid well the foundations for Lutheranism in the regions where they ministered to the people. All these men gave force and character to the work in Ohio because of their connection for a long time with the same synod, and their close relationship to the Ohio preachers in yearly conferences after 1812.

The Ministerium of Pennsylvania and the Synod of North Carolina were not indifferent to the wants of the West. They heard the appeals for aid and sent them traveling preachers, though they gave but a pittance for their support. Their treas-

uries were not full. They would have done more if their synodical funds had permitted. Some years they sent out a number of traveling preachers, in others, because of a shortage of money, they reduced the number to one. Then there was also a lack of young men who were willing to enter the work or whose education was of the character needed for the times. The older and better educated found ample opportunities for exercising the ministerial office east of the mountains. The Ministerium had in its numbers persons who were educated in Germany and knew what a theological education meant, and who insisted in holding the educational standard so high that few persons cared, in the absence of a suitable school to enter the ministry. It was not then in the power of the Ministerium to furnish all the men called for from Ohio. Had it been able to do so, the history of the Lutheran Churches within the State would be of a different character.

At the meeting of the Ministerium in 1804 three propositions were presented to that body from the special conference of the Lancaster district that looked toward progress in the Lutheran Church.

1. Concerning an institution for the education of young preachers.
2. Concerning a synodical treasury.
3. Concerning traveling preachers.

These propositions were adopted by the Ministerium, though in lieu of an institution for the education of young men for the ministry four pastors were designated as teachers for all candidates who sought to enter the holy office. At this meeting a petition was received from Columbiana county, Ohio, asking that Mr. George Simon be admitted to the ministry. A license was granted him as a candidate, and he was directed to minister in the congregations that might ask for his services, but was also admonished that the Ministerium desires that he receive further instruction. Mr. Simon was undoubtedly the first recognized Lutheran minister to serve congregations in Ohio, at least the first of whom record can be found on a synodical roll. His field was in Columbiana county, and here were, perhaps, the first Lutheran congregations in our State, though not yet fully organized.

At the meeting of the Ministerium in 1805 there is this entry

in the records: "Mr. Jacob Goering reported the death of the beloved candidate, Mr. George Simon, from Ohio." No further note or tradition is extant of his brief work, though it is believed that he was a good man and gave promise of a useful life in the Lord's cause among the people.

At the meeting of the Ministerium in 1805, it was resolved that a traveling preacher be named for the district called New Pennsylvania (in the State of Ohio) whose territory stretched from New Madrid to Lake Erie. To this field Rev. William Forster was appointed. His full name was likely William George Forster. In the records of the Ministerium he is known as William but in Ohio as George Forster. Rev. Forster's name first appeared on the roll of the Ministerium in 1798. At that time several congregations in Shenandoah county, Virginia, which he was serving, ask that he be made a member of the Ministerium, and thereafter serve them as an accredited minister. Their request was granted and he remained there until 1806. In obedience to the wish of the Ministerium he made a visit to Ohio in 1805 which he reported at the meeting in 1806. After his permanent arrival his field was in Fairfield county, which at that time embraced also parts of Perry and other counties. Through this part of the State ran Zane's tract. The land adjacent to this tract was rapidly taken up with permanent settlements, because it afforded the best route of travel into the new State. Hence Fairfield, Perry and other nearby counties early received a large influx of Pennsylvanians, Marylanders and Virginians, who were of German descent and thus made the region an important one for the first Lutheran preachers. Here in what is now Perry county, was formed one of the first Lutheran congregations in the State. It was at New Reading in 1805, and was the first religious organization in the county. It is still in existence. In 1806 Zion's congregation was formed. The Church building was in joint use by the Lutherans and Reformed. Rev. Forster organized the Church at Somerset in 1812. This congregation became quite a factor in the Lutheran history of Ohio. The first building was erected of hewed logs, had a gallery, and a pipe organ built by one of its members. Here the Synod of Ohio, now Joint Synod, was formed in 1818, and to this place in 1846 it was voted to transfer the Lutheran Seminary from Columbus, a purpose never carried out. There

are now seven Lutheran churches in the county, all under the control of the Joint Synod of Ohio.

Rev. Forster continued his work until 1815, at which time he died. He lies buried at Zion's Church, which he organized, in 1806. He planted well as the congregations of his ministry still show. In 1811 he located at Lancaster, O., where he was pastor for a time.

There were times in the history of these early preachers when things did not move smoothly with the various pastors. In 1813 Rev. Forster complains to the Ministerium of interference on the part of Mr. Leist. The complaint was referred to a special conference which decided that it was best for Mr. Forster to give up one of his congregations named Ziegler's, in Fairfield county, and for Mr. Leist to take the same.

Mr. Forster was somewhat disposed to do things in an unusual way. The congregations in Belmont, Jefferson, Guernsey, and Washington counties, wishing that Mr. Anthony Geyer might serve them, Rev. Forster granted him a license. When this action was reported to the Ministerium it met its disapproval and it resolved "that Rev. Lochman earnestly reprimand Mr. Forster in the name of the Ministerium, for assuming the right to grant Mr. Geyer a license."

Rev. John Stauch was the second traveling preacher sent to Ohio by the Ministerium. We have already noticed his coming to Western Pennsylvania in 1787, and his entrance into the ministry. He continued to labor there for nearly twenty years and met with much success in his work. But he was transferred to another field. In 1806 the Ministerium passed this resolution, "That Rev. Johannes Stauch shall be paid for his labors outside the congregations he has accepted in the State of Ohio just as other traveling preachers." Mr. Stauch's advent into Ohio was evidently made in 1806, though at the time of the meeting of the Ministerium he is still noted as from Fayette county, Pennsylvania. He made a report of the work done by him at the meeting in 1807. He showed that he had traveled 1300 miles, preached 67 times, baptized 212 children, and that he had spent one hundred and twenty days in the work. During the next year the low state of the funds prevented sending out more than one traveling preacher, and that one for three months only. Mr. Stauch was chosen for this service. The

other nine months were spent in his charge in Ohio. In the minutes of the Ministerium of 1808 Mr. Stauch is located at Lisbon, in Columbiana county. This place was the center of all his future labors. In 1808 he reports 356 communicants, and in 1809 fourteen congregations in Columbiana, Jefferson and Trumbull counties, and five vacant congregations, with a communicant membership of 505, and three schools. In 1812 he reports eight schools, and Forster reports four schools. From reports made from time to time to the Ministerium, the early Lutheran preachers in Ohio were very attentive to the instruction of the young. And so wherever possible they established schools under the immediate care of the congregations. The free public school system in the State was not in full operation until a much later period, hence for this and other reasons Church schools were maintained. The pastors could not give them much personal service, for their numerous and widely scattered congregations consumed all their time and energy. These schools were conducted by laymen who knew some of the rudiments of education.

Another person who had much to do with planting the Lutheran Church in Ohio was Rev. Andrew Simon, a brother of Rev. George Simon whose early death has been noticed elsewhere. In 1808 Mr. Simon who had been studying for a year past was granted \$30.00 to enable him to continue his theological studies. At the same meeting the following question came before the Ministerium: "Whether it might be more useful and advantageous that a young man be specially educated and set apart for the work of a traveling preacher, or whether another preacher be sent out for this work, as is customary." This subject seemed so weighty that further time was taken for deliberation. After an examination of Mr. Simon as to his preparation for the work, the Ministerium granted him a license and made him a traveling "preacher to the small towns and northern parts of Pennsylvania and to the State of Ohio." At the same time there was passed a restriction that no traveling preacher should encroach on the territory of a settled pastor.

Mr. Simon was the first traveling preacher who had not first been a pastor. The general opinion prevailed that one could not properly do such work without training in the pastoral relation, and the practice had hitherto been to send only such out

on missionary tours. The experiment in the case of Mr. Simon was quite favorable and was afterwards repeated with other men. Rev. Stauch made a request at the meeting at which Mr. Simon was licensed that the latter be sent to Jefferson and Trumbull counties in Ohio. This request was made because the field had become too large for one man to serve properly. Mr. Simon evidently spent the year in the above mentioned counties. The people under his care sent their thanks to the Ministerium at its meeting in 1809, and asked that Rev. Simon be made their permanent pastor which it pleased the Synod to do.

Sometimes these pioneer pastors met face to face some problems hard to solve, especially when there was danger of offending the sense of propriety on the part of the Ministerium. Rev. Simon was troubled with one concerning which he asked the opinion of the Ministerium in 1811. There being few preachers of any denomination in the new State, the people whose love for the ordinances of the Church was strong, being anxious to enjoy sacramental privileges, often sought them at the hands of ministers of other denominations. Mr. Simon by letter raised the question whether he was permitted to give communion to the Reformed people. The answer from the Ministerium was "that in case of necessity it might be given to any Protestant in good standing, if he cannot have the services of his own pastor."

Rev. Simon was perhaps inclined to occasional departures from strict Lutheran usage. In 1813 three congregations in Ohio whom he was serving complain that Rev. Simon does not abide by the Old Lutheran form of doctrine, thus showing that the laity of these times were often more churchly than the preachers. The Ministerium took the matter in hand, and after due deliberation directed Pastor Lochman to inform Mr. Simon of the complaints and "admonish him not only to conduct himself more circumspectly but also to abide by the pure old form of doctrine and to make no innovations, or there would be hesitation about renewing his license." Mr. Simon was a pastor in Montgomery county in 1818.

Between 1805 and 1818 many calls were made to the Ministerium for traveling preachers and pastors for the work in Ohio, all of which received attention and were granted as far as it was possible. Besides Forster, Stauch and Simon, there were Tiedeman, Dill, Liest, Henkle and others engaged in missionary work

in the State. Paul Henkle was especially active and where once known, always sought for. He did not live in Ohio, but had his residence for a number of years at Point Pleasant, Virginia. He made many visits as a traveling preacher mostly on his own responsibility but at times in the employ of the Ministerium. He began his missionary journeys among the sparsely settled districts of Western Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and a little later in Ohio and Indiana. His visits to Ohio were mostly made between the years 1808 and 1815. Unless under the employment of the Ministerium he lived from the little support that might be given him from the scanty means of the people whom he visited. In his little two-wheeled cart he made his journeys through the dense forests of Ohio searching out the sparse settlements, here and there, of Lutheran people and ministering to them greatly to their comfort and satisfaction. In 1812 the Ministerium fixed his salary at \$33.33 per month for as much time as he might spend in work. Traces and traditions of his visits and labors are found in Southern Ohio as far west as Montgomery and also in Champaign county. During his visits he preached the Word, administered the sacraments, instructed and confirmed the young, organized new congregations and encouraged those he found already in existence. The young churches in Montgomery county sought his services begging him to cast his lot with them.

Of the early preachers in the then West, Mr. Henkel was the most remarkable and conspicuous. At 22 he became interested in his personal salvation. He devoted himself at once to the work of the ministry, but believed that thorough preparation should be made for it. Under the tuition of Rev. Kruck of Frederickstown, Maryland, he acquired a considerable knowledge of Latin, Greek and other branches. In theology proper he made fair attainments. In the minutes of the Ministerium of 1783, at which time Mr. Henkel was twenty-nine, it states, "A certain Paul Henkel in the name of several congregations earnestly asked for license to preach and baptize children." After an examination in Christian doctrine and Christian character he was granted license, which was accompanied with a number of monitory rules for his future guidance of which the first one was, "To preach the Word of God in its purity, according to law and Gospel as it is explained in its chief points in the Augsburg Confes-

sion and the other symbolical books." The license given in 1783 was renewed from year to year until 1792 when he received ordination. In his early ministry he favored the Altered Augsburg Confession and was somewhat inclined to the new conditions that began to influence many of the preachers of all denominations in the West. In 1810 when elected to continue his traveling visits to Ohio and other States, Dr. Helmuth was directed to communicate to him this action, "And at the same time to advise him to have no dealings with camp meetings if he should find such departures from our evangelical ways." This was a period when the camp meetings of Kentucky were creating a great stir among the people west of the mountains. Few, whether in the ministry or among the laity, escaped the influence of this remarkable movement.

After a thorough study of the great Confession Rev. Henkel changed his views and accepted it in its unaltered form and had the twenty-one doctrinal articles published. Commencing with a small work on baptism and the Lord's Supper which he published in 1809, Mr. Henkel continued his publications, including hymn-books in both German and English and a catechism also in both languages. He died in 1825.

Perhaps no man of his day was so influential as he among the Lutherans of the West. He was a model in character, in zeal, and in theological views to all who met him, or read his books, and sang his collection of hymns. He not only led five of his six sons into the ministry, but through his efforts many other young men were induced to take the same step. He molded the character of future preachers and gave a trend to early Lutheranism in Ohio. He was a man of clear convictions and a strong teacher as well as preacher. By his own personal labors as a pastor and missionary, by the young men whom he trained for the sacred calling, by his catechisms and other writings he wielded an influence in many of the Ohio Lutheran Churches not only in his own day, but for years afterwards, making them conservative and close adherents to a strict interpretation of the Augsburg Confession.

While much praise is due the Ministerium of Pennsylvania for its interest in the scattered Lutherans of Ohio we must not forget the interest manifested in another quarter. The Synod of North Carolina was formed in 1803. Rev. Paul Henkel was

one of its founders and one of its strong factors. Many Germans from the South found their way into Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana. Their appeals came back to the Synod for preachers. In 1813 Rev. Jacob Scherer, a prominent member in the North Carolina Synod went forth as a traveling missionary. He passed through Tygart's Valley, Virginia, looking for neglected Germans, thence to Marietta, Ohio; from thence to Lancaster and Dayton, baptizing both young and old on his journey. At Dayton he preached twice to the Germans who, he says, were mostly from North Carolina and were ready to build a Church. He spent some time in the country adjacent to Dayton preaching to large congregations and baptizing their children. He makes this comment from what he had seen: "The spiritual condition of Ohio is dark; people of all denominations are intermixed, and, although they have many preachers among them, there appears to be a want of such who have sound doctrine and are of good repute." He was asked by the people about Dayton to become their pastor, but he did not heed their request. Later he settled in the State of Illinois and laid the foundation of many churches in that region.

Numerous requests for pastors came to the Ministerium from all parts of Ohio. The Miami country, the region about Dayton, was particularly earnest in its call for not only one but for several pastors. Germans from Pennsylvania as well as from North Carolina had settled in the Twin Valley and vicinity in considerable numbers. They were prospering greatly in material things but were anxious for regular religious opportunities. In 1809, though without a pastor the Lutherans joined with the Reformed in building a church for their common uses. With this advantage they had to wait until 1815 before a permanent pastor could be secured. Again it was from Stark county, and the Scioto region that the demand was made, all showing that the people had not forgotten the advantages and satisfaction that come from the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the ordinances of the Church.

As a result of these earnest calls Mr. Tiedeman, Mr. Rudisill, and Mr. Dill were sent into the State to look after the religious wants of the people. In 1813 the Ministerium expressed itself as highly gratified at the results of sending traveling preachers to Ohio. By them congregations were collected and organized,

some of which became quite flourishing. Already six to eight pastors were located and had found plenty of work. Nor did all the early ministers come from the East. Besides the Simon brothers, others who were residents of Ohio and who had felt the call to labor in the Lord's vineyard, were recommended and finally admitted into the gospel ministry. Mr. John Rinehart, who afterwards labored in Jefferson county, Mr. Anthony Weyer who served congregations in Belmont, Jefferson, Guernsey, and Muskingdum counties, Mr. Abram Schneider, and Mr. Weygandt were among those received into the Ministerium of 1815, who could be claimed as products of the Church in the West. These young men were brought usually to the notice of that body by petition from congregations who desired their services, and if they could pass a satisfactory examination they were sent back with the injunction to be diligent in study, and to remain in the fields to which they were severally called and sent.

An important movement for the Lutheran Church in Ohio occurred in 1812. Up to this time it was necessary for the ministers of the State having synodical connection, at great expense of time and money, to make a long and tedious journey across the mountains to meet the Ministerium in either Pennsylvania or Maryland. When there, they found many of the questions with which the Ministerium had to deal, of little interest to the members from the West. To avoid this long and expensive journey and to apply themselves to the consideration of questions with which they were immediately concerned, the brethren of the West felt that they should have a meeting of their own in which they could discuss such subjects. Such a meeting was held in Washington, Pennsylvania. At that time there were eleven ministers west of the mountains who were members of the Ministerium. This meeting was held in the charge of Rev. Weygandt on the 17th day of October in 1812. There were present Revs. Stauch, Forster, Meyer, Huet, Reinhart, Leist, Weygandt, and Heim. Those absent are mentioned as Revs. Steck, Simon, Butler, and Paul Henkel. Another meeting was held in Fairfield county, Ohio, in 1813, and one in Columbiana county in 1814. This latter conference asks the Ministerium for three things:

1. Whether the special conference might be represented at

the meeting of the Ministerium by one preacher and one delegate.

2. "Whether the Conference may examine sermons and diaries of the candidates without sending the same to the Ministerium for examination.

3. "Whether they, as they think proper, may permit their candidates to take charge of congregations and likewise change the congregations in their licenses."

The first and third requests were granted. To the second they answered, "That the representatives for each time from the western district shall bring with them to the Ministerium the sermons and diaries of the candidates for the purpose of examination." The Ministerium was not yet willing that oversight in the training of ministers should pass out of their hands.

In 1817 the special conference of Ohio ask that they might form their own Ministerium. This petition was denied, but it was answered that they might draw up a plan by which particular difficulties might be removed. Such plan was presented, and it was voted by the Ministerium that the ordained ministers of the special conference in Ohio, or a majority of them, be allowed to license applicants as candidates or catechists, and renew the license from year to year, but that each candidate and catechist shall send one sermon and his diary to the Ministerium meeting each year. The examinations were no light and easy thing. The members of the Ministerium stood for thorough indoctrination of all preachers admitted into their body, hence they held control of candidates and catechists as long as possible.

In 1818 the western brethren resolved to do what had been denied them the year previous, namely to form a synod of their own. For this purpose they met on the 14th day of September at Somerset, Perry county, Ohio, and founded the Ohio Synod. There were present: Rev. John M. Steck, Greensburg, Pa.; Rev. Johannes Stauch, New Lisbon, O.; Rev. Paul Henkel, Point Pleasant, Va.; Rev. John Casper Dill, Germantown, O.; Rev. Henry Weygandt, Washington county, Pa.; Rev. Jacob Leist, Pickaway county, O.; Rev. Johannes Reinhart, Jefferson county, O.; Rev. Heinrich Huet, Somerset, O.; Rev. M. J. Steck, Lancaster, O.; Rev. Schneider, New Philadelphia, O.; Rev. Wilhelm Myer, Canton, O.; Rev. Mohler, Kittanning, Pa.; Rev. Andrew

Simon, Montgomery county, O.; Rev. S. Man, Montgomery county, O. Rev. John Stauch was chosen President; Rev. Paul Henkel was chosen Secretary; and Rev. Weygandt was chosen Treasurer. The reports showed. communicants, 2551; schools, 54; and preachers 14. They recognized three grades in the office of minister, pastor, candidate or licentiate, and catechist.

The new synod licensed two men, Carl Henkel and M. Wachter.

About the time of the organization of the Ohio Synod the special conference thought it important to set forth its views that its Lutheranism might not be called into question. There had crept in among the churches men from Germany, some of loose theological views and of doubtful morals. They had as yet no synodical connection but were posing as Lutherans. They were going about disseminating their modified doctrines to the hurt of the churches. To meet the influence of these false teachers, a statement of the conference on baptism, the Lord's Supper, conversion and prayer was written and published by the secretary of the synod, Rev. Paul Henkel.

The Synod was urgently requested to send representatives to the meeting of the first General Synod. At the second meeting of that body in 1822 two delegates were sent; and it was decided to unite with it. It failed to send delegates to the several succeeding meetings of that body. After the opening of the Seminary at Gettysburg it refused all further overtures because of dissatisfaction with the theology taught there and which to them seemed to be dominant in the General Synod.

There were some problems with which the Ohio Synod had to struggle early in its history. The first was the language question. The Pennsylvanians, Marylanders, and Virginians who were transplanted to Ohio soil found themselves under conditions which made the use of the English language a necessity for themselves and their children. By 1826 there were so many churches and ministers who used the English language that the Synod was compelled to have its minutes printed in both German and English. In 1827 Revs. Andrew Henkel and M. J. Steck were appointed a committee to translate the Catechism into English; but in place of such translation, they recommended the one in use by the General Synod, and their report was adopted. They also resolved to use the English hymnbook published by the

Pennsylvania Ministerium. By 1836 the struggle for a more extensive use of the English language had become quite urgent. An English Synod was formed by the Ohio Synod that year. This new body was to hold close connection with the German Synod, send a delegate to its meetings annually, transmit a copy of its proceedings to that body, aid with one-half of the moneys contributed to its synodical treasury, the Theological Seminary at Columbus, and recognize the Augsburg Confession of faith as the unalterable symbol of the doctrine of the Synod. It was later agreed that there should be an English professor in the Seminary. Before this last action could be consummated the permission for such professor was repealed, which action led to the withdrawal of the English ministers from the Synod and the formation of the English Synod of Ohio. This new Synod sent delegates to the General Synod in 1843 and commenced proceedings for the establishment of an institution of learning which resulted in the founding of Wittenberg College in 1845.

The second problem that confronted the Synod of Ohio from its very beginning was that of missionary work in Ohio and adjacent States. It must expect less from other Synods now in the matter of assistance and in a measure take care of its own field. In 1820 it licensed and appointed as a traveling preacher Rev. Christian Espich who soon after visited Clark, Champaign, Preble and other counties and laid the foundation for numerous churches, some of which were afterwards served by Rev. Henry Heinecke whose fame as a preacher and pastor is surpassed by none in the Miami Valley.

About 1820 Rev. D. Schuh visited the scattered Germans about Sandusky and founded churches. But it was impossible to find enough men to follow up the places opened for work, hence Highland, Guernsey, Belmont and other counties were almost entirely lost to the Lutherans. In Cincinnati where a congregation was formed as early as 1812, the guiding hand of the Ohio pastors could not be exerted, hence for almost fifty years the development of German churches there was along independent lines and they were of little force in building up the Lutheran Church in Ohio.

The third problem of the Synod of Ohio was the securing and preparing men for the ministry. Now and then young men signified their desire to enter the holy calling but they were poor,

neither was there a school in which they might prepare themselves. In 1825 an effort was made to secure a library for such young men but the project failed for want of means. It was then voted to take up collections for their support, and that these persons should be divided out among the older pastors for instruction. Pastor Leist of Pickaway county took some students and Pastor Schuh of Sandusky took some, but in two or three years the plan came to an end for lack of financial support. In 1827 a committee was appointed to find a solution of the difficulty. After two years of consideration the committee reported that the time for the establishment of a school had not yet come, as the means were not at hand to support it. But in 1830 it was resolved to wait no longer. It was decided to establish a school under the title Theological School of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Ohio, to be located for the present at Canton, Ohio. Rev. Wm. Schmidt, pastor of the Church at Canton, who had been licensed in 1828, offered to conduct it without charge for his services for one year. An assistant was to be given him.

Rev. Schmidt was born in Germany, educated in theology at Halle and came to this country in 1826. For one year he was editor of a paper in Philadelphia. He then came to Holmes county, Ohio, and gathered the scattered Lutherans into a Church organization near Weinsburg in that county. He was undoubtedly the best educated man among his colleagues and so best qualified to take charge of the new school. Rev. Schmidt drew up an elaborate course of study which covered a period of three years. It included German, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Logic, Psychology and Ethics in addition to other more practical branches. The Seminary was opened in October, 1830, with two students. In 1832 it was removed to Columbus where it has since remained although changed to several different locations in that city. By the establishment of this school it was hoped that the days of greater prosperity for the Lutherans in Ohio were at hand but the failure to secure unity of feeling and purpose prevented the full realization of such hope.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE XI.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

The November number of *Theologische Zeitblätter* prints an able review of "The Theology of the Church and its Present Task" from the pen of Dr. Ihmels of Leipzig University. "Theology dooms itself to barrenness, unless it is conscious of the duty of serving the present. On the other hand, it becomes like the salt which loses its savor if it disconnects itself from the confession of the Church. It is, therefore, of prime importance that theology should find a synthesis between its ecclesiastical function and its modern character." "First of all, then, churchliness must be predicated by theology." "Theology has to show its churchly character by its conscious harmony with the confession of faith of the Church." "The churchly character of theology is preserved only when it does not shirk the duty of examining again and again the truth of the Church and her confession. Just for the reason that it is the theology of the Church but one authority dare be recognized in the last analysis—the authority of the divine revelation as attested by Scripture." "But with equal firmness the other requirement allies itself with the former that this theology must be throughout, present day theology. The men of the Reformation had the courage of being unreservedly men of their time." "We should fail to be disciples of the Master, who gave the Church, not for a definite time, but for the whole period of her development, the promise that the Holy Spirit should lead her into all the truth... * * * * * What else could He purpose to teach in the parable of the pounds than the truth that the possession of a gift is synchronous with its use. * * By the same token, the heritage left us by the Reformation can, in the realm of theological labor, remain ours only as we put it to use in behalf of the tasks which our time has for scientific effort."

The present tasks of theology are different from those which existed in the Reformation when theology was recognized as the queen of sciences. Now it must fight for recognition as a sci-

ence. Even then it was compelled to authenticate its scientific character, but the process involved was simple enough. Every science laid claim to an independent character by proving that it rested upon some self-evident principle. "This postulate theology appeared to meet by furnishing the proof that Scripture, which was accounted as its ultimate principle, authenticated itself as divinely authoritative by the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit, or by its immanent self-verifying power." But the very formulation of the matter implies inevitable complications. "On the very threshold of the argumentation in behalf of the Christian's assurance of his salvation, there arises a series of psychological and intellectual problems, which challenge the attention of theology so effectually that, in meeting the challenge, it finds itself placed in the very thickest of the scientific conflict of the time."

"The old time dogmatics, in basing the assurance of salvation upon the inner testimony of the Spirit, paralleled with this process another, namely, the finding of the point where supernatural revelation connects with the natural revelation, or intellectual cognition. Not in the sense, indeed, of making intellectual cognition the arbiter of the supernatural revelation. When the later dogmatics would turn into such or similar grooves it ceased to express the spirit of genuine Lutheranism. Notwithstanding, the attempt to find a common factor for the knowledge resulting from revelation and that resulting from reason suggests to us the possibility of welding both realms into a unit. That means again quite a number of most serious tasks for theology. The inner assurance of salvation, gained through purely religious channels, must demonstrate its right by the faculty of being welded into a unit with the knowledge of truth gained through other means."

Here we are confronted with a protest against Christianity raised in the name of natural science. As a matter of fact Christianity has nothing to fear from this source. More serious are the protests raised in the name of historical science. "Christianity fronts these in her most specific sphere. The claim to present fellowship with God, a fellowship historically mediated, cannot be severed from Christianity. Every attack, in consequence upon the historic foundation of Christianity is a direct attack upon Christianity itself. Above all it is clear that Chris-

tianity is interested in an adjustment of itself to the science of comparative religion. In this process new problems and tasks arise for theology in ever increasing number, and thus in proportion as the non-Christian religions are laid under contribution to common knowledge."

"But with that we have entered but the vestibule of theological problems proper." Apologetics, however, are not the main function of theology to-day. "Theology can have no other function than that of being the exponent of the peculiar knowledge which revelation proffers to faith. * * Viewing the scope of theology in its entirety, the conclusion is rather unavoidable that additional constructive work waits performance."

The Reformation gave a new meaning to faith as trust in divine grace. Luther took his stand on the old dogmas in the interest of saving faith. The former is really an expression of the latter. But it cannot be affirmed that the Lutheran dogmatics adequately set forth their relation. They did not establish a clear relation between the formulas and the simple faith. For example, pietism showed great indifference toward the objective foundations of faith in the emphasis which it placed upon the subjective element of godliness. Rationalism went further and repudiated the supernatural character of Christianity and so sacrificed the objective redemptive facts.

Schleiermacher returns to the principles of the Reformation in seeking to establish a connection between faith and the formulas of dogmatics; but he makes piety entirely subjective. In recent theology great progress is evident, with this drawback—that Revelation is not admitted to all its rights.

Theology must profit by advancing knowledge in every sphere. But it must not assimilate knowledge without testing it, nor must it use methods which have stood the test in other spheres, nor be subservient to extra-Christian science. Theology must recognize especially the progress of knowledge which God has given his Church in the clearer historic setting of Old Testament history and even of the Person of our Lord.

The Harvard Theological Review (Oct.) contains an exhaustive treatment of "Christless Christianity" from the able pen of Dr. Warfield of Princeton. Starting with an allusion to the "Christ Myth" by Arthur Drews, published in 1909, and his subsequent

lectures under the auspices of *Monistenbund*, Dr. Warfield brings out the attitude of the *Protestantenverein* which was challenged to reply to Drews. The Verein declined the challenge partly because it did not wish to advertise the monists, partly because it was satisfied for itself with the simple proofs of the historicity of Jesus, but chiefly "because it was a matter of no importance to it whether Jesus ever lived or not." It was declared that "every true religion lives not because of 'accidental truths of history,' but because of 'eternal truths of reason.'" "Whether Jesus existed or not, is for our religious and Christian life, in the last analysis, a matter of indifference, if only this life be really religious and Christian, and preserve its vital power in our souls and in our conduct."

This is of course, a very old heresy, but its classical period is that of the enlightenment and its chief expounder Lessing and its classic treatise a tract issued in 1777. Dr. Warfield traces the error through the various philosophers down to Eucken, showing that it is the product of the old rationalism, which assumes on the one hand the adequacy of pure reason to produce the whole body of religious truth which it is necessary or possible to embrace, and on the other the inadequacy of history to lay a foundation of fact sufficiently firm on which reasonable men may rest their convictions and aspirations.

Dr. Warfield reminds these philosophers that a perusal of Butler's *Analogy*, Greenleaf *On Evidence* and Ram *On Facts* might not come amiss. Christianity is a great historic religion, whose origin must be plain to the candid inquirer. The evidence in its favor is of the most compelling and varied kind. It is not merely documentary, but institutional; and even more it is its own best witness in its own character and vast influence for two thousand years.

These learned men have totally misconceived the spirit and nature of Christianity. It stands or falls with Jesus. He is the life of it. "Christianity is a redemptive religion, having as its fundamental presupposition the fact of sin, felt both as guilt and as pollution, and offering as its central good, from which all other goods proceed, salvation from sin through an historical expiation wrought by the God-man Jesus Christ. The essence of Christianity has always been to its adherents the sinner's experience of reconciliation with God through the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus

Christ." "If we demand the right to call ourselves Christians it is because by the teaching of Jesus that we have learned to know God as He really is, or because it is by His example that we have been led into a life of faithful trust in God."

"We may fairly contend that the germ of Christless Christianity is present wherever a proper doctrine of redemption has fallen away or even has only been permitted to fall out of sight."

"The Virgin Birth in the Second Century" by J. Gresham Machen is discussed at length in *The Princeton Theological Review* (Oct.). In the providence of God the denial of great truths is generally followed by the renewed investigation and the consequent firmer establishment of the matter denied. That the virgin birth of our Lord is unequivocally taught in the Matthew and Luke is patent and all efforts to explain it away have signally failed. This supernatural birth is demanded by the supernatural life and character of our Lord. It is of interest, however, to inquire whether this has always been the faith of the Church. In the article before us we have a careful and exhaustive examination of the teachings of the fathers in the second century. The Apostles' Creed, in its earliest form, A. D., 150, already teaches the virgin birth. Justin Martyr regards it as of fundamental importance, an opinion shared by Aristides in his Apology, A. D. 140. Ignatius, who died by martyrdom, A. D. 117 affirms it. The denial of the virgin birth by heretics, like Marcion and Cerinthus, indicates that it was the common faith of the Church.

The results of the investigations show:

1. A firm and well formulated belief in the virgin birth extends back to the early years of the second century.
2. The denials of the virgin birth were based upon dogmatic or philosophical prepossessions more probably than upon historical tradition.

In *The Bibliotheca Sacra* (Oct.) Professor Henry C. Sheldon discusses "The Question of a Reform of Romanism" in view of the optimistic expectations of some Protestant writers. The answer to the question must be determined by an examination of facts. Dr. Sheldon examines the recent record of Romanism along four different lines: (1) sentimental devotion; (2) sacramental theory; (3) papal absolution in the ecclesiastical domain;

(4) teaching and practice bearing on the subject of the relation between Church and State. The reference to the first of these topics the author declares that in no other fifty years, in the whole history of the Church, have papal initiative and practice been so emphatically engaged in promoting the cult of the Virgin Mary as during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Not only did Pius IX solemnly decree as a dogma of the faith, the immaculate conception of the Virgin (1854), but he rivaled, not to say transcended, the most extravagant tributes rendered to her by the idolatrous fancy of the Middle Ages. In an encyclical (1849) he said, "God has placed in Mary the fulness of all good, that accordingly we may know that if there is any hope in us, if any grace, if any salvation, it redounds to us from her." In the decree imposing the dogma, he describes Mary as "the most powerful Mediator, who ever slew all heresies, * * and having been made by the Lord queen of heaven and earth and exalted above all the orders of angels and saints, standing at the right hand of her only begotten son, our Lord Jesus Christ, does by her mother's prayers most potently impetrate, and finds what she seeks, and cannot be frustrated." His successor, Leo XIII, followed him in promoting the cult, declaring that "no one can come to Christ except through the Mother." The Catholic Church devoutly cherishes these sentiments to this day.

In reference to the second topic, concerning the sacraments, the author shows that Romanists still hold the absolute necessity of baptism, the omission of which deprives infants of the vision of God. They still hold the irrational doctrine of transubstantiation, and teach in reference to penance that without it there can be no salvation. "Forgiveness can not be obtained except through the ministerial office of the Church." For the office of the priest the most extravagant and even blasphemous claims are made placing him upon an equality with God himself in the matter of the forgiveness of sin. "God himself," says Gaume, "is bound to hold to the judgment of the priest."

In the third place "papal absolution in the ecclesiastical domain" is still rigidly maintained. Not only did the Vatican Council (1869-70) decree papal infallibility when the popes speak, *ex cathedra* on matters of faith and morals, but in a later decree the same council declares the pope infallible on all matters to such a decree that there can be no appeal from his decision.

He has full jurisdiction over the whole Church. The bishops are his creatures. The laity are the merest sheep. "The one duty of the multitude is to allow themselves to be led, and, like a docile flock to follow the pastors." The authority of Rome extends everywhere tolerating no rivalry even in external form. Leo XIII (1899) severely condemned any kind of a Church in America which should differ from the extreme Roman type. Modernism has also received the most absolute discountenance from the papacy. There is to be no investigation of sources. A Biblical Commission, composed of unscholarly men appointed by the Pope, naturally were no more than his tools in their findings concerning doctrine.

In reference to the relation of Church and State, the popes have never receded from the old assumption that the Church is supreme even in the domain of the State. Leo XIII (1895) declared that "it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful and expedient for State and Church to be as in America dissevered and divorced." In an encyclical (1890) Leo declared that "it belongs to the pontiff not only to rule the Church, but in general so to order the action of Christian citizens that they may be in suitable accord with the hope of obtaining external salvation." Many other citations of a similar character are made.

An aspect of tragedy pertains to the exigency which is upon the Roman Catholic Church. Having staked all upon the dominion of its dogmatic authority, it cannot revise the approved system without destroying the corner-stone of the structure. On the other hand if it refuses all modification and keeps on asserting its arrogant pretensions, it will be certain to repulse great numbers, with the likelihood that a large proportion of them will be driven into radical infidelity. A program of despotic enchainment of the human mind cannot be carried through in the coming age without most serious drawbacks. The retribution which in the divine order is appointed to truth-defying pretentious authority will arrive in its own time and manner."

"Systematic Theology and Ministerial Efficiency," is discussed by Professor Gerald Birney Smith, of the University of Chicago, in *The American Journal of Theology* (Oct.). Everything

must be brought to the efficiency test to be interesting and useful. This has not been done in reference to Systematic Theology, once known as "the queen of sciences." It must now be gotten upon a more rational basis. It is not enough to find this merely in the Bible. It must be historically wrought out, rationally grounded and brought into harmony with the modern spirit—the spirit of democracy and of the modern scientific spirit. It will no longer do to rest upon the alleged inspiration of the Scriptures. "The history of religion" is the watch-word. "The history of religious belief must take the place in the curriculum formerly occupied by a theory of inspiration. Three lines of study must be pursued to give systematic theology its true place. 1. A study of the history of doctrine. 2. The constructive task of formulating doctrine. 3. The apologetic defense of Christian faith. The study of the history of doctrine ought to be carried on under the direction of the department of systematic theology. Here the latter finds its true back-ground. "Indeed, there can be no more effective means of bringing the student face to face with the inevitable conditions of successful theologizing than to trace the way in which, in answer to the stimulus of great experiences, men of deep insight wrought out the answers to the questions which men are always asking. * * The proper appreciation of history furnishes a vast human laboratory in which the necessary experiments may be observed so as to induce skill in the diagnosis of a theological problem. * * Out of this study of the history of doctrine came certain results which are of great value." The first great value is that one is put into the place of those who formulated doctrine in the past, and gets their point of view, and thus "discovers precious interests in many seemingly barren controversies." "Again, such historical study will make the student acquainted with many varieties of religious experience, and will compel him sympathetically to appreciate many forms of belief which he himself does not hold." "In brief, a historical introduction to the study of doctrine will give to one such a sympathetic understanding of orthodoxy that it will remove the temptation to which much modern thought is prone, viz., that of failing to discover the real religious vitality underneath theological expressions which seem formal. Thus in contrast to the exclusive attitude of the minister whose point of view is dogmatic rather than historical, a man

whose approach to the construction of doctrine has been such as has been here indicated will be enabled by this very method of approach to enter into the religious life and the actual problems of many types of experience, and will realize that no form of doctrine can be efficient unless it actually helps men to find a satisfying and an uplifting answer to the questions which come from the depths of the soul."

Concerning "the constructive task of formulating doctrine" the author says that "it is peculiarly difficult in our day," because the most thoughtful and conscientious whose help is most needed find no convincing power in the old type of theology. Hence "the teacher of theology ought to open all critical questions in so fundamental a form that the student shall himself feel the agony of uncertainty which is so prevalent in our day. * * It is not a bad thing to jeopardize one's comfortable sense of assurance by the discovery that it costs something to get the truth in theology as well as in other realms." Having analyzed problems so that the real issues may be seen, the department is then to help to formulate beliefs which belong to a Christian experience. This formulation "must take into account the facts of our modern world, with its belief in the uniformity of law in contrast to the older belief in miraculous interventions; * * * with its outlook on an indefinite future history of this world in the place of the older expectation of a sudden catastrophic ending; * * with its confident faith in the natural power of man to achieve ideals of goodness, in place of the older belief in human inability; * * with its honest agnosticism concerning things out of reach of any empirical testing, in place of the older assumption as to the reality of angels and devils in heaven and hell," &c., &c.

"The apostolic defense of the Christian faith" is a task hard to define. "The apologetic of our day is in danger of proving an actual damage rather than a help to religion, if it seeks to retain the conception of a 'final' or 'absolute' system of doctrine." Indeed "modern apologetics is not primarily a defense of doctrine. * * To discover the unquestionable facts of religious life, and vindicate the rights of this life to organize itself into doctrinal and institutional form constitutes the primary task of apologetics."

"Such in brief should be the aim of the department of syste-

matic theology in a modern divinity school." Heaven save the mark! we say. No doubt there is some truth in Professor Smith's attitude; but his process of preparing men for the ministry side-tracks the Bible, substitutes a subjective for an objective standard, eliminates faith, actually discredits the experience of the best men of all the ages and leaves only a purely naturalistic basis for religion with a modicum of the supernatural.

It is true that large liberty may be allowed concerning non-essentials; but it is undeniable that the great fundamentals of the Christian religion are accepted and cherished by many million people including the most noble and intellectual of the race. It has been our experience that the intellectual people (whom Professor Smith would win) are often entirely ignorant of theology, and therefore incompetent to express an opinion concerning it. Sometimes they oppose some unimportant detail which they magnify out of all proportion; and always they must be reckoned with as poor sinners who need the illumination of the Holy Spirit that the things of God may not be foolishness unto them. We argue for no blind acceptance of doctrinal formulas nor do we hold that any human statement is infallible, but we do believe that the consensus of the best consciousness of the Church throughout the ages expresses the truth in a way that it is helpful and not misleading. The minister who goes forth equipped with a systematic theology which gives him truth in its right relations and proportions, based upon the revelation of God in the Bible, will have a norm and a guide that will save him from danger and assist him in preaching Christ, who is the Truth and the Life.

The Hibbert Journal (Oct.) contains an article by the Hon. Bertrand Russell, Cambridge, Eng., on "The Essence of Religion." He assumes the practical passing of "traditional religious beliefs" and "dogmas." He is glad to believe, however, that a religious life may be lived without dogma, when we subordinate the finite to the infinite within us. The essence of religion lies in three things which ought to be preserved amid the wreck of Christianity. These three are, worship, acquiescence, and love. These are defined in the most vague terms. Worship, it is said, may exist without a belief in God. Acquiescence means

largely a stoic submission to the inevitable. Love breaks down the walls of self that prevent its union with the world. How absurd as ever against the simple and beautiful dogmas of Christianity with their teaching of an Infinite Creator who is also Father and Redeemer! The rejection of the creeds of Christianity generally means the introduction of the creeds of singular and immature minds or of those of philosophy falsely so-called.

The Methodist Review (Nov.-Dec.) has an article by David G. Downey on "The Kingdom." The kingdom interpreted by the Lord's Prayer means "that some day science and society, commerce, letters and politics * * shall be purified and uplifted; * * that one day God's will is to be done on earth as it is now done in heaven." The supreme purpose of Christianity is to bring in the kingdom. Several phases of activity are considered. (1) Revivalism and the kingdom. Revivals are glorious and do good, but "the revival in its very nature is occasional, special and extraordinary, and has the virtue and the defects of its nature. The real work has been done and always must be done through the channels of the regular, the daily, and the ordinary." (2) The Church and the kingdom. "The Church is divinely ordained for bringing in the kingdom." "When the Churches depend less upon outside agencies and special times and seasons, and more upon their divinely ordained and guaranteed powers, and especially when the ordinary and regular ministry and service are instinct with the presence and power of the living Christ, and when through these channels the Christ touch and life are put in contact with individual and communal need—then will the kingdom come with increasing power." (3) The ministry and the kingdom. The call of God, the ordination of the Holy Spirit, and the commission of the Church combine to assure the minister of the unction and power essential to one who would be a good minister of Jesus Christ. "It is to be regretted that a certain type of evangelism seems to disparage the regular ministry." "Nothing is more pitiable than to see ministers, hat in hand, standing at the door of some high-priced evangelist beseeching him to come and undertake the work for the doing of which the Church is organized and the minister himself called, commissioned, and ordained. The imperative need of our day is a generation of men surcharged with spiritual

confidence and spiritual self-respect; men who will feel that under God and through the agency of their Churches they are abundantly able to give full proof of their ministry. (4) The laity and kingdom. "Once more the men and women who sit in the pews must realize that *they are the Church*. If the kingdom is to come, the parents must realize a burden and responsibility for the spiritual nurture and training of the children. Neighbors must be interested in the spiritual condition and well being of neighbors. (5) Literature and the kingdom. Better and more interesting reading must be provided by the Church. Christian laymen must invest talent and money in building up great newspapers that will stand for righteousness. (6) The youth and the kingdom. "We hold that all children, by virtue of the unconditional benefits of the atonement are members of the kingdom of God, and then we go on and treat them just as if they were members of some kingdom not God's." The young must be saved and then enlisted to save others.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M. B.D.

In the department of Historical Theology also new works and new editions of old works, books large and small, appear just as regularly and just as generously as the current theological papers and magazines. They indicate just as exactly as the periodicals in what direction the current of interest and action runs among the historians.

Several recent works of a general character may be noted first. Chief among these is a new volume from the pen of Professor Hauck of Leipzig. It is the first half of the fifth volume of his well-known *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*. This work has long been recognized as a standard. The newest addition will not detract from the high repute of the former volumes for it shows all the familiar evidences of Hauck's masterly hand in his appreciative interest in the significance of the smallest details as well as his comprehensive grasp of the great historic connections and his discriminating art of presentation. This first half of the fifth volume treats the period extending from the middle of the 13th to the middle of the 14th century, that is, from the death of Frederick II to the death of Lewis of Bavaria. This epoch Hauck entitles: *The Church of Germany During the Be-*

ginning Decline of the Papal Power. In tracing the relations of the Papacy to the German Church the author draws splendid portraits of the individual popes. Then he lays bare the complicated process through which the Church degenerated from a spiritual to a merely political principality. In showing the development of theological thought during this period Hauck finds that the mysticism of Eckhart, the theology of personal experience, is a more faithful interpreter of the times than the pure speculation of Thomas. The increasing importance of preaching and of pastoral ministrations during this century is an evidence of deepening spiritual life and greater personal piety. The middle of the 14th century finds neither emperor nor pope successful in the effort at supremacy in both fields.

Another recent work of a general nature that cannot fail to be of interest to Lutherans in America is Friederich Uhlhorn's two-volumed history of the Lutheran Church in Germany (*Geschichte der deutsch-lutherischen Kirche*). The first volume brings the history of German Lutherans down to the year 1700; the second volume continues the account to the very present. The author is a strictly confessional Lutheran of the Hanover type and has no sympathy whatever for the Prussian Union or the ecclesiastical authorities in Prussia. The disposition and diction of the book indicate that it is intended for popular circles rather than for theologians and specialists. But just this would make it acceptable reading among American Lutherans. There is no mention of sources or bibliographies. With lively enthusiasm for the past of his Church and strong personal sympathy for the positive Lutheran theology of the present Uhlhorn guides his reader through the details of the history of Lutheranism in Germany and prepares him for an objective judgment concerning the total life of the Church. The several varieties of Lutheranism as they have developed in various parts of the empire are portrayed not only in their differences but more especially in that larger element which is common to them all. The development of Lutheran doctrine is not treated so fully as might have been desired. Tholuck's researches might have been used to advantage in a fuller description of the inner life of the Church. Nor does Lutheran hymnology receive its due. But the work easily surpasses Rocholl's history and serves a different purpose from that of Kahn, and any one who wishes to orientate himself

thoroughly in the history of Lutheranism in Germany and to see how the present came to be, will find in Uhlhorn a satisfying guide.

Meanwhile Adolph Harnack has completed his work as a writer of the history of doctrine. His *History of Doctrines*, that monumental work that towers high above his many others and has occupied more of his life than any other single task, has now appeared in its fourth edition. It has been thoroughly revised and considerably enlarged, comprising in all 2479 pages. With this edition Harnack lays down the work in that field. For he insists that he will make no further revision. With the true instinct of a historian, however, he realizes that his great life-work shares the relativity of all historical works and will surely be superseded sooner or later. Thus in bidding farewell to this field he seems to look forward to a new stage in the discipline, when he says: "Perhaps someone is already preparing the work which shall constitute this new stage."

Concerning Harnack's conception of dogma and his historical method we need not go into details. That has been sufficiently discussed in an earlier report (*LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, July 1911, pp. 444-454; *vide* also *LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, Jan. 1912, pp. 139-144). Suffice it to say that if the "new stage" of which Harnack writes is to come at all, it will be brought about by historians who hold a very different conception of doctrine and employ a very different historical method from that which he employed. Within the bounds of Harnack's method no real advance can be made. Harnack has shown himself a master in his sphere and his work constitutes a closed type which cannot be surpassed by anything of its own kind. But there are other kinds of history of doctrine. And there is much room for progress when the historian's method of treatment is based upon a sound philosophy of history, when he does not regard the dogmas of the Church as mere stereotyped formulas, long since antiquated, whose origin and development can be made to submit to "exact" historical investigation. The path for such progress in this discipline is clearly indicated by the method employed by Seeberg. He does not indeed neglect the thorough and exact investigation of details and sources according to the approved modern historical methods. In this the Seeberg school is just as industrious as Harnack, or Loofs, or the religio-historical school.

But Seeberg goes further than that and shows the inter-relations of dogma with personal piety and Church worship. And what specially marks him as distinct from Harnack and points out the way for progress in this science is the fact that his entire presentation is characterized by a conscious effort to meet the problems of theological and historical epistemology and to base upon a sound philosophy of history. This is not an annulment of clear historical perception nor a return to the ideology of Hegel but it is simply a deeper grasp of the underlying problems of history as based upon correct philosophic presuppositions. Without this there could be no advance beyond Harnack's method and this splendid fourth and last edition of his *Dogmengeschichte* would indeed be practically the last word on the subject.

Among the historical works of a more special nature, those relating to the Reformation period and modern times seem to predominate in number and in interest. Luther's attitude toward the Jews has frequently been discussed, but Reinhold Lewin's *Luther und die Juden* is the most thorough and informing treatment that topic has yet received. Luther's attitude toward the Jews was not always the same. Until 1521 he has not come into touch with them and his interest in them is purely theological. But in that year Luther is visited by two Jews in Worms, and despite his experience with them it occurs to him to seek to win them to the Gospel of Christ. Accordingly in 1523 he writes his *Missionschrift* pointing out that Jesus Christ was born a Jew and inviting the Jews into the Christian fold. But that was the high-water mark of his friendly interest in the race. Personal experiences were disappointing and after 1524 his feelings gradually underwent a change until in 1546 he wrote his *Warning Against the Jews*. In this change of feelings Luther was actuated not by political motives but solely by the attitude of the Jews towards the Gospel. In our day of absolute toleration such anti-Semitism might be called fanaticism but that term cannot be applied to Luther in his day.

The interesting question concerning the history of the influence of Luther's Bible upon German literature has received a partial answer in a small volume by Holm Zerner. He comes to the conclusion that "The September Bible spread at one stroke over the literature of all Germany." In the Royal Library at Berlin he has examined 681 prints, all made in the years between

1522 and 1525, and he has found that the quotations of the Bible in these years were made from Luther's translation in rapidly increasing measure. Thus already in 1522 23 per cent of the Biblical quotations are from the September Bible, in 1523 44 per cent., in 1524 72 per cent., and in 1525 77 per cent. With such surprising rapidity did Luther's translation displace all others.

The keen interest which attaches to the history of the Reformation period in all its aspects and all its details has not failed to bring within its scope also the Catholicism of that period. As in the study of mediaeval Church History there has been a revival of interest in the monastic orders, so in the history of the Reformation period the origin of the Jesuits receive a large share of attention from Catholic historians. The investigation of this order is especially timely just at present when the imperial authorities at Berlin are being sorely tried with the problem concerning the status of the Jesuits in Bavaria. Hermann Stoeckius has begun to issue a series of brochures calculated to make accessible the authentic sources on the history and the life of the Society of Jesus during the 16th century, *Forschungen zur Lebensordnung der Gesellschaft Jesu im 16. Jahrhundert*. Two of the numbers have already appeared. They are thorough, scholarly and impartial. They open up a welcome vista into the internal life of the order and the various relationships among the members in those early days. Another work along the same line is the volume by Moritz Meschler, *Die Gesellschaft Jesu. Ihre Satzungen und ihre Erfolge*. Meschler is the octogenarian counselor of the Jesuit General in Rome. His object is to orientate by reference to authentic sources concerning the aim, the means, and the achievements of the order. He writes in a dispassionate and conciliatory vein but with a deep love for the order of which he has been a member for 61 years, and the consequence is that his book is more an apologetic for the Jesuits than a history. He gives the impression that the Society of Jesus is a harmless historical phenomenon with no special significance apart from the religious and moral. A third work from a Catholic pen is of still greater importance and interest to Protestants than the two already mentioned. It is a history in three large volumes of the struggle between Protestant civilization and Roman Catholic civilization in Germany, J. B. Kissling, *Geschichte des Kultur-*

kampfes im deutschen Reiche. Only the first volume (500 pages) has as yet appeared. This traces the conflict in Brandenburg-Prussia from the beginning of the 17th century to the year 1871. The author, who writes under commission of official Catholicism in Germany, is specially concerned to show that the so-called toleration of the Prussian kings towards their Catholic subjects and towards the Catholic Church is pure myth and legend which must now be dispelled. Frederick the Great is represented as an intolerant tyrant in his dealings with the Roman Catholics. In fact the spirit of ultramontaniam, which is the spirit of polemics against the Prussian State, broods over the whole book. The lines of historical development are traced very superficially and no effort is made to understand and weigh the motives which actuated Prussian Church politics. The present political and religious situation in Germany might well be served by an objective and penetrative account of the history of the great *Kulturkampf* which has so often embroiled German politicians. But Protestants will never be satisfied with the work of Kissling for it affords no deep historical enlightenment. A real task remains unfulfilled.

Many efforts are being made to-day to deduce the significance for our own times of the 16th century Reformation. Paul Wernle has just published a series of lectures entitled *Renaissance und Reformation* in which he seeks to evaluate those two movements in their significance for general history. Wernle looks at the Renaissance from the point of view of the history of civilization and is far from the ancient error of forcing the religious significance of the movement. He sees the import of the Renaissance in the fact that it overcame the two fundamental mediaeval ideas of a divine State on earth and of the ethical ideals of the saint. This was accomplished through the rise of individual nationalities and through the discovery and liberation of "true human nature." Nevertheless because of its respect for antiquity and its submission to traditional authority the Renaissance cannot be said to mark the beginning of modern culture. The predominating factors in the Renaissance movement were man and beauty, whereas in modern culture they are nature and science. Furthermore, the aristocratic tendencies of the Renaissance prevented it from being in any sense modern. The Roman

ecclesiastical organization was left untouched by this movement because of its aimlessness and abject conformity to the Church.

But while Wernle avoids the error of overestimating the religious significance of the Renaissance he falls into the opposite error of seeing only a general cultural significance in the Reformation. In his estimate of the Reformation he is much indebted to Ernst Troeltsch. His point of view allows him to lose sight of the great religious innovations as the chief characteristics of the Reformation movement and to subsume everything under the head of general culture. For we read: "When we come to the Reformation we meet with a culture which is morally constituted and is vitalized by the power of Luther's happy and heroic trust in God and by an unbending devotion to duty." So far as religion is concerned he sees many mediaeval elements in Luther's Reformation. Here the dogmatician dominates over the historian and Wernle makes no substantial addition to what Troeltsch has said in his well-known essay in the *Kultur der Gegenwart*. He speaks a good word against ecclesiastical unionism when he shows that the lack of outer uniformity is the very source of Protestant life and growth. He points out one difference between the Reformers and modern thinkers in that the Reformers were concerned about man's justification before God whereas modern thinkers are concerned about God's justification before men. And finally it is asserted that modern culture receives its characteristic features not from the Renaissance nor yet from the Reformation, but from the empiricism of the natural sciences, from the rationalism of philosophy, and from the economic and political transformations that have taken place since the 16th century.

These sharp distinctions between the thought and feeling of the Reformation period and the thought and feeling of the present day has led to a wide-spread distinction between Old Protestantism and New Protestantism. The latter had its beginning about the middle of the 17th century. Of its general import and content there are three main conceptions as Horst Stephan points out in his latest work, *Die heutigen Auffassungen vom Neuprotestantismus*. According to Richard Rothe the chief characteristic of neo-protestantism is to be found in its relinquishing of all special organization of religious life. According to Karl Sell its chief characteristic lies in the transformation of

the ecclesiastical organization into free social forms. Finally, according to Ernst Troeltsch the chief characteristic is the strengthening of church fellowship by the giving up of church peculiarities. These are simply three different ways of saying that Protestantism has individualized Christianity. And if this be true, then it applies to Old Protestantism as well as to New Protestantism. The new type of Protestantism which began in the 17th century was merely a fuller and more conscious personalizing of religion than that which the first century of Reformation history had brought forth. The differences therefore between the Old and the New are not fundamental as were those between the Middle Ages and the Reformation period. But the details of this question have occupied the attention of historians for some years now and they still stand in the forefront of the interest in the Reformation period.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE XII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—We very cheerfully give space to the following communication. We have no desire to do an injustice to any author, or book, in our *Review of Recent Literature*. Our sole purpose is to give to our readers a fair idea of the scope and purpose of the books reviewed, and some intimation of their value. The "criticism" of which this writer complains is found in the October number of the *QUARTERLY*, pp. 606-608, if any of our readers care to refer to it.]

EDITORS LUTHERAN QUARTERLY REVIEW,

DEAR SIRs:—The sarcastic tone of your criticism of my "*Philosophy of the Future*" seems to justify the claim for a page or two wherein to set myself aright before your readers.

Your one objection worthy of notice, is that I have not clearly defined causality. Now, a merely formal definition, by genus and differentia is in this case impossible; for there is no wider genus under which causality can be subsumed. But there are other methods of strictly defining such a concept. I have devoted an entire chapter (pp. 10-28) to one such method—to differentiating true causation from such spurious forms as sequence, etc. And throughout the book I have constantly emphasized the contrast between a complete cause and partial causes, i. e., factors in a complex causal process. In neglect of that distinction the prevailing confusion concerning the term cause is rooted.

But my ultimate aim was to solve the three greatest of all problems—the existence of God, of man's freedom and the soul. Let me roughly outline my results.

(a) In the first half of the book it was proved, against Hume, that every act of thought was essentially an affirmation of causality; therefore to deny causation was logically impossible, since it would involve the extinction of thought. Then it was proved (pp. 148-165) that beyond the mere aggregate of imperfect causes or factors in natural processes there must be a perfect cause having the four attributes of unity, infinitude, freedom and love. And that perfect cause with these attributes and their implications is the God of theism. No Kantian criticism can break down that demonstration of God's existence.

(b) The problem of freedom, also, can be solved only when interpreted in terms of causality. I have just read Dr. Ballard's very able and earnest defense of freedom. Yet finally he

surrenders everything. "Why," he asks, "does a man choose one alternative rather than another? A choice for no reason is unthinkable. * * But does not that reason determine his choice?" It is he concludes an "insoluble mystery." We have "to choose between an antimony and an infinite regress."¹

But it is all a mistake. A reason for acting may urge, but it can never compel to action. It is not a complete but a partial cause, merely one factor in the complex process of volition. A reason is abstract, powerless, until energized by the free consent of the man himself.

In fine, to comprehend causality we must begin with its highest, freest, most perfect forms. We can never learn the real nature of causation or anything else by studying only its imperfections, its most defective and therefore obscurest types. As Aristotle said long ago, "By the concept of the straight we discover both the straight and the crooked; while the crooked is not a test of either itself or the straight."

(c) There are two main reasons for the present decay of belief in the soul. The first is that the soul has always been conceived in terms of mere substance—a narrow, misleading category applicable only to material things. That error we avoid by interpreting the soul in terms of causality. Instead of vainly searching for some strange soul-substance secreted somewhere inside of us, we must think of body and soul as two causes different, but complementing each other on the process of human life. The second reason is the soul's invisibility; modern thought demands proof; it scorns the unverified assertion of the imperceptible as mere superstition. But mark now that causation is unseen; no one has ever caught a glimpse of the causal bonds that bind the universe together. And yet I have proved that it is logically impossible to deny or even doubt the reality of causation. Why then doubt the existence of your soul because it is invisible?

Of course all these are but vague hints. Indeed the book itself, is, confessedly, very imperfect—the crude forecast of an intellectual revolution that is sure to come. In that conviction I am strengthened by such criticisms as that of the *Homiletic Review* for November, which—without fully endorsing my views, ends with this sentence: "This interpretation of ultimate reality in terms of causality is destined to become far more influential than it has yet been and this presentation is a good push in that direction."

S. S. HEBBERD.

1 Ballard Determinism 239-40 and 422.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

Outlines of Liturgics. By Edward T. Horn, D.D., LL.D. Second and revised edition. Pp. 162.

We are glad to welcome a new edition of this excellent manual, first published in 1890, especially since the old edition has been out of print for some time. We have all too little literature in English on this very interesting and important subject, become all the more interesting and important because of the revival of a Lutheran consciousness in our churches in this country, and a consequent tendency to return to the customs of the fathers in our forms of worship.

Dr. Horn's book, as we are informed on the title page, is based on "*Harnack in Lockler's Handbuch der Theologischen Wissenschaften*," and is largely a translation of Harnack, "with additions from other sources." It is in the form of questions and answers and is well adapted for either class-room use or private reading and study. The very term "Outlines," used in the title, indicates that it makes no pretense to being an exhaustive study of the subject of Liturgics. But it is sufficiently full for the general reader or student. An excellent Bibliography is given at the close for the guidance of those who wish to follow up the subject further.

Not much matter has been added in this "revised" edition, and not many changes have been made in the text. Perhaps the most important additions are made under the head of *Literature on the Subject*; where two new subjects have been introduced, and over forty new titles added. An Index of Names and References has also been added.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

The Lutheran Almanac and Year Book for 1913. Compiled by Miss Grace Sheeleigh. Paper. Pp. 152. Price 10 cents.

This sixty-third issue of the *Almanac* is more complete and interesting than any of its predecessors. Every Lutheran family ought to have a copy. It gives a variety of information about our Church, its Boards, its Institutions, its Synods, etc. The General Synod now numbers 1,367 ministers, 1,796 congregations and 316,949 confirmed members. The entire Lutheran Church in this country has 8,937 ministers, 14,207 congregations, and 2,296,588 members.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

Mother, A story by Kathleen Norris, illustrations by F. C. Yohn. Cloth. Pp. 172. Christmas edition. Price \$1.25 net.

The clever author has given us a very delightful romance, in which the follies and foibles of "the upper ten" are brought into

contrast with the simple but more real life of the middle class. A young lady, a village school teacher, fretting under the tasks and hopeless prospects of her position is accidentally brought to the attention of a great city lady of wealth, refinement and high social standing, who engages her as private secretary. The young lady is charmed, but becomes aware of the hollowness and duplicity of "society." She accompanies her mistress to Europe and there falls in love with a young American professor, who visits her in her village home to her great regret. For her home is somewhat topsy-turvy, and she is inclined to be ashamed of her parents, brothers and sisters. The mother, however, is really a wonderful woman, cheerful and happy, makes the best of the situation, and has the true view of life. The young professor at once sees the true worth of the mother, pleases the father and delights the boys. He proposes to the young lady, is joyfully accepted and while he goes to Europe for a year she gladly resumes her old position in the village school until the professor shall return to claim her.

There is just this fault in this beautiful and wholesome story and that is the absence of a strong and distinct religious element in the family. The boys go sailing or fishing or playing on Sunday. Perhaps this is only too true to life, but it is not the high ideal which it is the privilege of the novelist to create.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Brief History of Modern Philosophy. By Professor Hoeffding of Copenhagen. Translated by Professor C. F. Sanders, Gettysburg, Pa. Pp. 324. Price \$1.50 net.

Professor Sanders, of our college at Gettysburg, has again put the English speaking world under obligations to him, by giving us in our own language a book that we need.

The great Danish philosopher, Hoeffding, is already known to us through translations of his former important works: Ethics, his larger History of Modern Philosophy, Psychology, Philosophy of Religion, and Problems of Philosophy. In addition to these books, he had also published a study of English philosophy of the present day, a work on formal logic, a volume on the development of the Kantian philosophy, a discussion of Rousseau and his philosophy and several other books, and numerous important articles in philosophical journals. He wrote almost all of his books and most of the more important articles before he prepared this *Brief History of Modern Philosophy*. It is the product of his ripest scholarship; when it appeared he had already been a writer of books for more than thirty years. A few pages selected anywhere in this volume will convince the reader that it is the work of a mature scholar. With sovereign

mastery of material and graceful diction he puts entire systems on a few pages, or into a paragraph or even a few sentences,—you get Kant in twenty-two pages—and when he has done it his presentation is as remarkable for its clearness and completeness as it is for its brevity.

It is intended for use as a text-book, that is, as a guide in the study of the history of philosophy with the living teacher who will amplify in discussion; and for this purpose it is admirably adapted. It will also be useful for one who wishes to get a compact survey of the entire field of modern philosophy, especially if he already has some knowledge of the various systems. For these purposes it is probable that we do not have its equal in English; the book meets a felt need.

It is also remarkable because of its up-to-dateness, but this is necessary for a good text-book. It is seldom that contemporaries are treated in histories of philosophy, and these are just the men about whom we are often most anxious to have information. Here we have in brief outline, not only the systems of the old masters, but also those of Wundt, Bradley, Boutroux, Bergson, Eucken, James and others. All of those named save James are now living.

The work of the translator is well done; the foreign author is made to speak good English. The book lacks the ear marks of a translation; it has the ease and smoothness of style that should characterize a well written original production.

S. G. HEFELBOWER.

EATON AND MAINS. NEW YORK.

The Christian View of the Old Testament. By Frederick Carl Eiselen, Professor in Garrett Biblical Institute. Pp. 265. Price \$1.00 net.

The standpoint and *motif* of this volume are very well set forth in the Preface, which is as follows:

"During the past half century the attitude of many men toward the Bible has undergone a decided change. The old confidence seems to be gone; a feeling of uncertainty and unrest has taken its place. This small volume is intended to set forth the Christian view of the Old Testament, and to furnish answers to some of the questions men are asking concerning the Sacred Scriptures of the Hebrews, which the early Christians included in the canon of Christian sacred writings. The old foundations are not shaken. The Old Testament has stood the tests of the past which have been severe and often merciless; and there is to-day stronger ground than ever for believing that in its pages men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit."

It is, perhaps, enough praise to say that this purpose is well carried out. Some conservative readers may feel that the author is surrendering too much, it is certain that many radical readers, if he has such, will pronounce him over-conservative. This itself would be pretty good evidence that he has about struck "a golden mean."

There are six chapters dealing with the following phases of the problem involved; *The New Testament View of the Old Testament*; *The Old Testament and Modern Science*; *The Old Testament and Modern Criticism*; *The Old Testament and Archaeology*; *The Old Testament and Comparative Religion*; *The Permanent Significance of the Old Testament*.

The book is for the general reader rather than for scholars, but its value for the latter is greatly enhanced by copious "notes" at the end of each chapter giving references to authorities quoted or referred to.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Biblical Criticism and Preaching. By George Elliott. Pp. 96.

Price 35 cents net.

This is another of the many volumes now coming from the press intended to allay the alarm caused in the minds of many by the work of the so-called "higher critics," and the onslaughts which they seem to be making on the authenticity and integrity of the Scriptures, especially the Old Testament. While the author evidently wishes to maintain a sympathetic attitude toward the critics, he as evidently does not believe that they have undermined the authority of the Bible as "the Word of God," or destroyed any fundamental truth of our holy religion. His main contention is that while the preacher cannot ignore the "conclusions of modern scholarship" in his pulpit work, he need abate nothing of the truth, nor of the power of the Scriptures, in dealing with the spiritual life and interests of his people.

While the book is intended especially for preachers, the author expresses the hope that "it may also be of use in stilling the tumult in the minds and hearts of many perplexed but loyal laymen."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Crises in the Early Church. By John Alfred Faulkner, Professor of Historical Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. Cloth. Pp. 166. Price 75 cts. net.

The aim of this book is to give a brief, scholarly yet popular account of several great crises in the history of the Christian Church. The reputation of the author is a guaranty that this aim has been realized. A perusal of the book will abundantly

confirm this. Beginning with the conflict with Judaism in its New Testament phase and its post-apostolic development, he traces the victorious march of Christianity down through the centuries, conquering Gnosticism, Montanism, Monarchianism, Chiliasm, and Arianism; and finally asks, "Will Christianity Remain a Spiritual Religion?" This question is asked in reference to what he apparently fears to be a Romanizing tendency in worship in the use of elaborate rituals. He says, "Even the service in evangelical churches to-day is formality itself beside the simple and affectionate frankness and reality of the first Christian worship." In regard to this I am not sure that the exact form of worship in the early Church is fully known, or that it was intended to be a model for all time. Under the workings of the Holy Spirit and the experience of the Church through the centuries, it has been found edifying in all the great historic denominations to have forms of worship. In these I see no menace as long as the people are allowed their part, and the priest-hood of believers is maintained. A well ordered "service" gives dignity and propriety to worship, which often otherwise becomes a wearisome, slipshod egotistic performance on the part of the pastor who lacks intelligence and unction.

The periods reviewed were eras of great interest, when, humanly speaking, the character of Christianity was seriously jeopardized but always finally vindicated. We have not the space to look separately at each one of these crises. There is this general lesson—that the Church is ever in a state of conflict. Old heresies have passed, at least in their ancient form; but new ones ever agitate the Church. A study of her history gives one confidence that she is divine and that the gates of hell shall never prevail against her. As long as she holds on to the deity and the humanity of Christ, the God-man, and to the Bible as the inspired Word of God she will be safe. The moment she lets these go will she drift from her moorings and make shipwreck of her faith.

We hope many clergymen will refresh their knowledge of Church History by reading Dr. Faulkner's little volume; and we hope also that they will commend it to their intelligent laity.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA CO. OBERLIN, O.

Origin and Antiquity of Man. By G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A. Cloth. Pp. xx, 547. Price \$2.00.

This latest volume by Dr. G. Frederick Wright of Oberlin will find a ready welcome from a multitude of Christian readers. His careful scientific researches and his sane and conservative

construction of data into rational theories inspire the reader with confidence. Firmly grounded in the Christian faith, a believer in the Bible, he has a vast advantage over the agnostic or materialist, who lacks the illumination which comes to a man who trusts the living God. By this we do not mean that Dr. Wright proves his case by quotations from Sacred Writ, for his processes are strictly scientific, based upon exact observation of natural phenomena.

The origin of man is attributed to the creative action of God. As to its method no one may speak with absolute certainty. The author accepts the evolutionary hypothesis in its theistic form. "The doctrine of evolution as it appears in modern science is not a doctrine pertaining to ultimate things, but to the secondary processes of nature, and does not in any way interfere with the legitimate arguments of theism. The processes of evolution demand a Creator of infinite power and wisdom to set them in motion." (p. 407). "That doctrine of evolution, which best adjusts itself to both the geological and biological facts of the world, is one which admits of paroxysmal development at certain epochs of progress" (p. 373). In short, the author holds that the infinite Creator gave a new impetus to man at critical formative periods. This accounts for the vast difference between man and the ape family.

The antiquity of man is very great, but not nearly so great as has been represented. By learned arguments based upon geological grounds our author shows that man did not exist previous to the Pleistocene period, the fourth and latest general division of geological time. Efforts to trace man to the Tertiary period have not succeeded. He first appears in the Glacial epoch, which occupies the early part of the Pleistocene period. His age must be determined, therefore, by the appearance of the Glacial era. "Post-glacial time in particular during which man has been an inhabitant of the earth" "is to be reckoned by thousands of years, rather than by hundreds of thousands or even tens of thousands." In recent years scientists have been led to reduce their estimates of geologic time from five hundred million years to twenty-four million.

The conclusion at which the author arrives, is that "while the antiquity of man cannot be less than ten thousand, it need not be more than fifteen thousand years. Eight thousand years of pre-historic time is ample to account for all known facts relating to his development."

This conclusion is not at all at variance with the Bible. In a quotation from a learned article written by Dr. Green, it is shown that the biblical genealogies were never intended to be a chronological record. The Bible gives no date directly or indirectly of the creation of Adam.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE F. J. HERR PRINTING CO. COLUMBUS, O.

Freemasonry, An Interpretation, by Martin L. Wagner, Pastor of the St. John's English Ev. Lutheran Church, Dayton, Ohio. Cloth. Pp. 563. Price \$1.50 net.

This stout and well-written volume by Pastor Wagner contains an astonishing interpretation of Freemasonry. Dr. Gerberding in his Introduction affirms that the secret society system is "the greatest foe that the Church has to contend against. It insidiously undermines and overthrows the very foundations of evangelical Christianity. Its tendency is to make men indifferent to doctrine and hostile to the positive teachings of Revelation."

Mr. Wagner's charges against Freemasonry are that it is a false religion, that it is an esoteric institution derived from the ancient mysteries of Phrygia, Greece, Egypt, Samothracia, Sidon and other nations, and worse than these that in ethics it is immoral and unclean.

In substantiation of the charge that it claims to be a religion and hence a substitute for Christianity he affirms that (1) It claims to have a revelation, (2) has its own temples, (3) its altars, (4) its religious symbols and emblems, (5) its confession of faith, (6) its own priests, (7) its religious services, (8) its own forms, (9) its rituals, (10) its own peculiar worship and (11) its own distinctive deity.

To substantiate the charge that Freemasonry is related to the mysteries of the Orient and of antiquity the author cites numerous parallels. Moreover, he holds that its symbolism is suggestive of the ancient phallicism in which procreation is worshipped.

In confirmation of his assertions the author quotes numerous authorities. In extenuation of the act of many excellent people in uniting with this society the author charitably states that they have been hoodwinked, and that the lower "degrees" of the order fail to reveal its true character.

Personally we do not belong to any secret order and shall never unite with any. We are sure of this that many Christian people find no objection to belonging to the Masons; and we have been assured by them that there is nothing irreligious or immoral in this order. Perhaps they are mistaken; and it would be well for them to examine carefully the charges made by Mr. Wagner. Should they be found to be well-grounded, then all professing Christians ought to come out and be separate. Surely Christianity can tolerate no rivalry or sham. It often occurred to us while in the pastorate when we were called upon to officiate at the burial of members of lodges that it would be well for the lodges to give up religious ceremonies, and, if they must exist, confine themselves to purely social, beneficiary or business lines of activity.

We cannot predict the effect of the volume before us. There ought to be enough influence in it on the one hand to prevent men from joining the Masonic order until it shall have vindicated itself; and on the other its members ought to ascertain whether or not they have been hoodwinked.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE WARTBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE. CHICAGO.

The Doctrine of Man, Outline Notes Based on Luthardt. By Revere Franklin Weidner, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary. Cloth. XVI. 199. Price \$1.00 net.

This volume is the fruit of thirty-five years of preparation for work in the class-room. Five great standard works lie at its foundation, viz., Luthardt's *Compendium of Dogmatics*, Krauth's *Conservative Reformation*, Delitzsch's *System of Biblical Psychology*, Müller's *Christian Doctrine of Son*, and Harless' *System of Christian Ethics*.

These Outline Notes are a valuable compend, more suited, it seems to us, for reference than as a text-book for beginners in theology. The positions taken are orthodox and, of course, in harmony with Revelation. The interpretation of the doctrine is that of the above named authorities and of the symbols and dogmaticians of the Lutheran Church.

In following the psychology of Delitzsch, the author has reproduced the former's somewhat complicated ideas in reference to the constitution of man, as body, soul and spirit. Then the spirit is further analyzed, and a "triplicity" is asserted. "Corresponding to the three persons of the Trinity, we can distinguish in the human spirit, the *nous*, the *logos* and the *pneuma* of the nous, or the mind, the word, and the spirit of the mind." "The product of the nous or mind is the *logos* or word." "As the Logos is the basis of all other thoughts and words of God, so the Logos is the archetype of the human logos, primarily of the thought of Ego, wherein man becomes objective to himself as a person." This is surely curious reasoning and utterly without Scripture authority. Christ is the only Logos, the incarnate God, the revelation of God. There is nothing in man corresponding to this high thought of the Divine Logos.

However valuable this compend of Dr. Weidner's is, we wish he had worked the matter over in his own mind and experience and given us, as he is well able to do, a more original product, which would be at once more coherent and simple.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE PUBLICATION AND SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD OF THE REFORMED
CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The Life of the Rev. Benjamin Bausman, D.D., LL.D. By Henry Haverstick Ranck, pastor of St. Andrew's Reformed Church, Reading, Pa. Cloth, Gilt top. Pp. 439. Price \$2.00 post-paid.

Dr. Bausman was a notable figure in the life of the Reformed Church, profoundly influencing her history during the more than fifty years of an active and fruitful ministry. He was born of German stock in good old Lancaster county, Pa., in 1824, was ordained in 1853, and died at Reading in 1909, at the ripe age of eighty-five.

Mr. Ranck has done his work as biographer with excellent judgment, avoiding all fulsome laudation, and presenting the life-picture of his great-uncle with modesty and fidelity. Fortunately there was so much biographical material at hand that the author became rather the editor. The Publication Board has brought out a fine volume in green cloth, with good print and paper, and a number of portraits and other illustrations. Not only will his friends all over the Reformed Church want Dr. Bausman's biography, but it ought to find a place among the biographies of distinguished men.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the volume is the first fifty pages, which are largely autobiographical. They tell the story of the boyhood and youth of the great preacher in a typical Pennsylvania German family, where discipline, prosperity and piety develop splendid character. There is a charming simplicity and ingenuousness in Dr. Bausman's account of the old home and his childhood that reminds us of the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin.

Among his teachers were men like Nevin and Schaff, and among his associates Harbaugh and Higbee. He lived during a period of great unrest in his Church, but he refrained from controversy and so became a mediator in the subsequent peace movement.

He was a man of prodigious industry, a prolific writer in German and English, the author of several volumes and the editor of two papers. These labors together with numerous general church duties, were only secondary to his work as pastor and preacher at Lewisburg, Chambersburg and Reading. He spent the last thirty-six years of his life at the last place, influencing for good a growing city, and leaving as his visible monument a magnificent Church edifice and a flourishing congregation. He was a fine writer, an excellent preacher, a man with a prophetic spirit, gentle, lovable, noble and strong, a man whose life was worth while.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

